



## 2009 GRANITE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN REVIEW SURVEY SECTION II

### COMMUNITY-PROPOSED POLICY CHANGES

(Please provide input on policy issues suggested by members of the community.)

#### HOUSING/POPULATION

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
PROVIDE CURRENT/UPDATED POPULATION FIGURES.	<b>49%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>

#### Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)

- 3 Why do we need this? What is expense to taxpayers?
- 4 Yes.
- 26 I'm assuming this will be part of 2010 Census.
- 29 If 1989 says holding capacity should be reduced to 23,000 then it needs to be followed.
- 30 Do not exceed population limits in the current plan but reduce.
- 35 23,000
- 41 All benefit by these population figures and by these as they change.
- 46 Via email.
- 50 Also provide potential population changes based on current pending planning applications that would rezone properties to less intense or other uses.
- 59 Sure.
- 77 That's a given.
- 78 Wait for the Census. I don't want the County to pay for duplication.
- 93 There should be collaboration with school districts and water districts in planning for the future- also Placer's SMD #2
- 123 Unsure what this means.
- 124 Not sure what this means- obviously you need good data to see where population is now.
- 157 Why not?

164	The population should be updated every ten years, just like the Census. Similarly, the plan for Granite Bay should be updated every ten years.						
165	And housing types.						
174	That costs money. Leave Granite Bay as it is. Go with 2.3 acre + lot size then no worry about population.						
180	Wait for the Census.						
229	Do not understand what you are asking here.						
236	Don't know what this means.						
<b>THE 1989 GRANITE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN "HOLDING CAPACITY" SHOULD BE REDUCED FROM 29,000 RESIDENTS TO 23,000 RESIDENTS OR FEWER.</b>		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		<b>43%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
8	Unrealistic.						
12	While this would be nice, I am not sure it is achievable. How can a property owner who bought a parcel zoned for 'x' number of lots, now be told it can only be developed to a fewer number?						
17	Due to sewer constraints. Maintain the rural character of Granite Bay.						
23	Currently we are at 17,000 residents, so reducing capacity to 23,000 or less still provides for reasonable growth.						
25	Even 23,000 is too many.						
26	Still a big increase. Probably don't need to go that high.						
30	Great idea.						
41	Number is OK as is in plan. 29k residences is just fine. 17k to 18k residences are now in place, I believe.						
43	Can't. Density already given in 1989. Can you deny them?						
45	What is the basis to reduce the holding capacity? Do not use this as grounds to open the existing plan.						
49	There is too much growth now.						
50	Not at expense of rezoning or redesignating residential land for non-residential land.						
68	No high-density residential or commercial.						
77	If can be done without taking density/zoning already in plan.						
78	I'm not sure how this can be accomplished.						
83	If this can be done without affecting densities already granted.						
85	If this can be done without affecting densities already granted.						

- 89** I understand the current population is approx. 17,000 to 18,000. Due to the traffic problems and accompanying safety concerns increasing GB population 33% (23,000) is too much. There should be no changes that will increase density, so GB will build out to less than 23,000.
- 93** To the extent the lowered "holding capacity" does not conform to zoning, a scramble would ensue to get first in line, and then, perhaps, a political backlash. What is the current population? Development works best when it is orderly.
- 105** We do not want to add high-density residential or commercial.
- 111** Most important policy change.
- 112** Don't understand what "holding capacity" means.
- 122** Probably about right the way it is.
- 124** Density as is now is good. Growing it to 23,000 is sensible, then re-evaluate for growth to 25,000 if it makes sense later. There is no need to grow to 29,000.
- 127** Please leave the 1989 plan alone.
- 131** Can that be legally achieved?
- 136** This is more in line with actual numbers.
- 141** Don't really understand statement as I don't have figures showing population growth over past 10 years.
- 154** Yes.
- 164** I don't know what the right number is. In either case, we will never be a huge city.
- 166** This should be evaluated from two perspectives- The updated community plan overall, and a greater level of specific planning as shared in previous comments. The "number" should be the reasonable by-product of this joint evaluation.
- 172** If this stops the rezoning to smaller parcels, we support.
- 173** 20,000 max- This was the size of my hometown, Yerba Lina, a rural-ag community in Orange County much like Granite Bay until developers took hold of it in the 1980s. The systematic destruction continues today- no more horses or avocado trees- just roads and traffic. Check out the way ugly pictures at rdgb.org- the town annexed neighboring undeveloped land and is now 70,000 population.
- 174** At this time, traffic is bad on Auburn Folsom and Douglas.
- 177** Depends on the purpose of the change. If it is to allow more room for commercial capacity then I would be opposed.
- 184** Or less than 23,000.
- 236** This was a Uhler hoax. He "supports a cap" but Michael Johnson says it is not workable.
- 240** Fewer. Sewer capacity is less than 23,000. Limit growth to existing sewer capacity (approx. 19,000 to 20,000).
- 242** Stay at current level of 17-18,000. Misleading question.
- 244** What is current population?

<b>HOUSING NEEDS (I.E. RETIREMENT, LOW-INCOME, ETC.) WITHIN GRANITE BAY SHOULD BE RE-EVALUATED.</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	<b>33%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>1%</b>

**Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)**

- 1** Vague, Ambiguous, Uncertain.
- 2** No low-income. Only retirement people.
- 3** This is not needed- there is plenty of these types of facilities nearby.
- 4** No new.
- 9** What makes Granite Bay the community it is the current mix of development density (leaning towards the low/mid-density lot sizes and rural land uses). By changing this mix to include retirement and low-income housing, we will lose or at least diminish the attractiveness of this community.
- 11** I don't know enough about what we have in these categories to comment.
- 18** We don't need The Enclave project.
- 19** There is little chance of low-moderate income being developed here. As a part of this county that requirement is being met elsewhere.
- 20** Re-evauation does not equate with revision.
- 24** This should be done in coordination with the County's General Plan as required by law.
- 26** Don't know issues here.
- 29** Affordable housing needs to be planned in quiet areas with access to trails not on the south side of Douglas, across from the Lutheran church. No low-income housing needs to be built.
- 30** It's OK as is.
- 35** We need a mix of residents and more serves geared for retirees; i.e. bus, shopping, medical
- 37** People in the community should be able to downsize, retire, and stay in Granite Bay.
- 43** Retirement should be one-story and near services.
- 45** Not used as a basis to open the existing plan.
- 48** Retirement.
- 50** Such needs are available elsewhere.
- 59** By the MAC.
- 64** Let the market drive proposed development.
- 68** No high-density residential of any kind.
- 70** All "mandated" housing needs should be reviewed and the results noted in the plan.
- 77** Are many retirement communities in area. Granite Bay has a variety of housing sizes/lots that can accommodate downsizing.
- 83** Currently provided.
- 89** Per Uhler and Planning, since GB is unincorporated State mandates for housing such as low-income, etc. does not consider GB by itself. GB is included in the numbers for the entire county. At a MAC meeting, Planning said recent State requirements were met from planned development in W. Placer unincorporated area.
- 91** There is sufficient low-income and high density units in place. Retirement units should be evaluated.

- 93** When was the Housing Element of the GBCP last updated? I understand (hearsay?) that the current plan conforms to State of CA requirements, but how is this documented?
- 98** Smaller homes with energy-efficiency (solar). Better insulation techniques now exist. Single-story.
- 100** I think smart-growth should apply.
- 105** We do not want to add high-density housing.
- 107** Why?
- 109** In so far as it will be consistent with or improve the overall community and environment.
- 114** Not necessary at this time.
- 123** Current plan is fine.
- 124** Current plan is fine.
- 128** No. Granite Bay has an identity which works and should not be changed. Granite Bay 95746 zip codes have approximately 1000 homes under 2400 sq.ft, one-story on average sized lots. Senior housing is not needed.
- 129** No, leave alone.
- 130** Keep plan as is. No specialty housing.
- 131** Why? Current plan is sufficient.
- 132** No. Why would you need to do this? If it is not broken don't fix it.
- 135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 136** More developments will mean higher traffic patterns- already at our max.
- 138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 139** No current problem with housing needs.
- 141** I don't understand implication of "re-evaluated."
- 157** Not needed.
- 158** No low-income housing.
- 166** Relates to previous comments within.
- 170** Agree only if review includes potential expansion of such uses as "fair share" of regional needs.
- 172** If you want to maintain our image...don't change it.
- 173** Not in favor of this if it involves rezoning/splitting of properties.
- 174** We have the necessary low-income homes. Keep Granite Bay as is.
- 175** There is a significantly higher density to these types of housing and these needs are already met in nearby communities like Roseville, Orangeville and Folsom.
- 178** No low-income, no retirement. No new development.
- 180** Retirement developments should be encouraged to be single-story or have an elevator if two-story. Low-income housing should be discouraged.
- 184** No change to existing community plan.

<b>236</b>	This is necessary only to extent required by State law. No case has been presented for such an evaluation.						
<b>238</b>	No. This small community does not need the types of structures which support the socioeconomic groups listed above.						
<b>240</b>	Re-evaluated based on what criteria?						
<b>241</b>	This would seem to go against the tenets of the Loomis Basin General Plan.						
<b>243</b>	No.						
<b>245</b>	By who? For who? Not as a grounds to encourage further development.						
<b>A VARIETY OF HOUSING TYPES SHOULD BE MAINTAINED WITHIN GRANITE BAY TO PROVIDE RESIDENTS THE ABILITY TO UP-SIZE OR DOWNSIZE ACCORDING TO THEIR NEEDS WHILE REMAINING IN THE COMMUNITY.</b>		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		<b>23%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
<b>2</b>	Except for low-income housing. He have six trailer parks.						
<b>3</b>	This already exists in Granite Bay.						
<b>4</b>	No.						
<b>9</b>	This proposal must remain consistent with the overall land use goals of the community plan- mixed densities, preserve rural feel of Granite Bay, open space, etc. If significant rezoning is required (to higher density) which violates these tenets of the community plan, I would strongly disagree.						
<b>10</b>	Yes, but with adequate design and planning so as not to spoil adjoining areas.						
<b>12</b>	The market should drive the variety of housing types and not the County government.						
<b>17</b>	We must stop rezoning lots to make more houses. Keep the existing zoning and lot sizes so that we do have a variety.						
<b>25</b>	But no low income or apartments.						
<b>26</b>	Probably conflicts with rural character.						
<b>31</b>	Maintained as-is. No need for high-density like Enclave proposal.						
<b>37</b>	Exception: Low-income housing.						
<b>43</b>	More one-story.						
<b>46</b>	Only if zone changes are not part of upsize or downsize.						
<b>51</b>	No more "mega mansions" only reasonable size homes on 1/2 acre to 1+ acres.						
<b>59</b>	Any changes should be reviewed comparable to the plan by the MAC.						
<b>60</b>	This area is not appropriate for high-density housing.						
<b>62</b>	We already have that.						

- 68** No need for high-density. Go to Roseville or Folsom for this.
- 77** Current plan provides this range.
- 78** Current plan provides diversity.
- 89** Currently there is a variety of housing types. The Seeno neighborhood and the neighborhoods across from Cavitt allow for downsize and starter homes. Their prices were comparable to and even less than homes in Roseville.
- 93** How is this a realistic policy if the "holding capacity" is reduced by 6,000? Would this be implemented by PD bonuses?
- 105** No need to build high-density/lower income housing. There are adjacent communities offering plenty of it.
- 122** Diversity.
- 123** Current plan is fine.
- 124** Current plan is fine.
- 130** No specialty housing.
- 135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 136** There are several nearby communities that provide this type of choice. No need to build more.
- 138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 139** Not a current problem.
- 165** We first need to know the current status of housing types- how many single-family homes (1, 2, or 3 stories), apartments, condos, duplexes, mobile homes, assisted living units, care facilities, etc.
- 166** Less about upsize and downsize of current residents, but move to have a reasonably diverse set of options for all current and future residents.
- 170** Including low-income, senior group homes, dense multi-family in addition to single-family.
- 172** There is a variety...not what is being recommended.
- 173** Do not agree with this by rezoning or splitting. This is a family community. Lincoln Hills is a senior community. Citrus Heights is a high-density apartment/condo community. Both are close by.
- 175** This is why "horse property" (2.3 acres or more) should not be divided. The original plans balance needs to be preserved.
- 180** Prefer .9 acre or larger lots with larger homes for remaining undeveloped parcels. There is already plenty of smaller homes people can downsize to.
- 184** No change to existing community plan.
- 229** Implicit in this statement, should it be adopted, is additional development.
- 233** Already available.
- 236** The market and existing zoning already take care of this.
- 238** This is not a clear recommendation- what is meant? We currently have both large and smaller homes in our community.
- 240** We are a middle-class bedroom community. We cannot and should not try to meet the needs of every age group and socioeconomic group.
- 242** Stay out of it.

- |            |   |
|------------|---|
| <b>243</b> | No.   |
| <b>244</b> | Minimum lot size needs to be maintained.                        |
| <b>245</b> | There is enough variety of housing. This is an excuse to build. |



LAND USE						
THE RURAL-RESIDENTIAL QUALITY OF THE GRANITE BAY AREA SHOULD BE DEFINED AND PRESERVED.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	54%	19%	13%	11%	1%	0%
Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)						
1	It's Already Defined.					
4	OK.					
8	Some rural residential places are a mess.					
43	Yes.					
45	Kept as present.					
47	Needs to be balanced with use of land for office, retail, cultural, civic.					
59	It is defined.					
64	However, balance is good. Visit King Ranch Place off Sierra College- very bad. Results to a similar objective.					
68	Absolutely. We can go to Roseville for high-density.					
86	Define rural-residential. I think five acres are/will become outdated.					
89	Leave plan as is- no changes.					
90	The current definition of this rural-residential quality is adequate.					
91	Avoid development of multi-acre parcels into small lots.					
93	This is already done in the community plan.					
105	What's why we moved here.					
108	Absolutely.					
109	Preserved yes, has it not already been defined?					
122	But allow smaller parcels (2.3 acres is ideal for rural).					
123	Current plan is fine.					
124	Current plan is working fine.					
136	Absolutely. Rural-residential needs to remain.					
139	No changes in zoning on Itchy Acres Road.					
140	Especially 4.6 acre rural estates.					
155	No more growth.					
163	1989 document does this.					

- 164** It should be defined first. How can anyone say it should be preserved if it isn't defined? Unfortunately many "rural" areas just look run down with unmaintained property and "junk" strewn around. "Rural" doesn't necessarily mean beautiful.
- 166** This policy statement should be re-evaluated and updated if necessary, as a result of other policy statement updates for consistency.
- 171** Follow the 1989 document.
- 173** This is the whole reason we chose this community. How many places are like this? It is very special, but it won't be too special if it gets changed.
- 174** 2.3 acre lots and farm res/ag zoning.
- 230** Already seems to be defined.
- 234** I thought it was already defined.
- 236** The existing plan already does this. No changes.
- 243** By who? The residents or the developer?

ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT AGRICULTURAL USES WITHIN THE EXISTING GRANITE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN SHOULD BE REVIEWED.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		14%	22%	25%	25%	13%	0%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
3	Why?						
4	OK.						
8	No objection. Don't feel a change is totally necessary.						
9	Assumptions should be reviewed to ensure accuracy.						
11	The current assumptions have adequately served our community.						
26	?						
35	Agriculture has been a part of Granite Bay, provides open space, and diversified element.						
43	We need more room for ag and horses.						
45	No. Not as a basis to open the existing plan.						
47	Vineyards, other agriculture should be welcomed.						
48	Very few exist- future water supply will not be adequate.						
51	Existing and new agricultural areas need to be maintained and not sold for housing or commercial properties.						
54	There are already clearly established.						
59	By the MAC.						
60	What are the current "assumptions?"						
68	Leave as is.						
70	What "ag use" is allowed on parcels < 1 acre, > 1 acre, > 5 acres, etc? Is gardening considered an ag use related to "ag parcels?"						
73	That is vague. I believe we should preserve any agricultural uses as they currently exist.						
74	If County regulations permit agricultural use, this plan should not initiate further restrictions.						
77	OK as is.						
78	No change.						
86	Itchy Acres was planned as small farming- that no longer exists or makes sense in Granite Bay.						
89	Leave plan as is- no changes.						
91	We moved here to be in a rural/agricultural setting. We can no longer appreciate the use of our 4 acres. Water meters limit agricultural irrigation and we can no longer afford to maintain a year-round pond. This is a huge loss for us in preserving wildlife.						

**93** This is a San Juan Water issue. How can agricultural uses be encouraged when water is metered? Already, water is being pumped from creeks (Fish and Game issue).

**105** Reviewed for what reason? Need to be more specific.

**107** Good like they are.

**109** To what end?

**111** Covered in the community plan.

**112** What would the purpose be to review?

**122** Limits from decreasing water and agricultural demand.

**123** What does this mean? Current plan is fine.

**124** Current plan is fine.

**135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.

**138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.

**139** What assumptions? Why required?

**141** Don't know what the "assumptions" are.

**143** Already covered in the plan.

**148** Why?

**149** It's already in the community plan.

**153** Does not need to be reviewed. Already in the plan and working for most Granite Bay residents.

**157** What assumptions?

**166** And also more specifically defined.

**170** Do not allow preclusion or limitation of livestock unless there are special circumstances.

**172** What are the assumptions? I am in support of agricultural use.

**173** Not sure what is wrong with the assumptions except perhaps that they are not shared by outside developers.

**174** Yes- ag water should be reduced in cost. Keep Granite Bay green.

**175** How many self-serving developers would love to say that horse property and orchards are outdated assumptions?

**180** Raising farm animals should be maintained on appropriately sized parcels.

**184** No change to existing community plan.

**236** The existing plan is clear enough.

**238** What assumptions? What does this statement mean? I don't have the existing plan, can't find it online, how would I answer this question?

**242** Why? Sounds suspicious.

AGRICULTURAL PARCELS OF LAND SHOULD MAINTAIN A MINIMUM OF ONE ACRE.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		30%	26%	24%	14%	6%	0%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
1	Or more.						
2	Nobody needs more than one acre to live on.						
4	No.						
7	At the very least one acre.						
10	Livestock populations and ag practices should be monitored and controlled if necessary.						
11	Are these "working" lands? If so, can less than one acre be viable as ag land?						
23	One acre seems almost too small. Should be two or more for agriculture.						
26	No. Should be larger.						
34	I don't know the ramifications- nor what current regs are.						
41	Five acre agricultural parcels of land are economically marginal and less that 2 acres (here one) are inefficient use of Granite Bay land.						
45	Would like five acres.						
51	Larger sizes would be favorable especially for animals.						
54	Isn't this what exists now?						
55	At least 2-5 acres minimum.						
59	This needs to be reviewed by the MAC on a case-by-case basis and should be governed by the existing plan.						
60	"Agriculture" should be greater than one acre.						
70	What practices are allowed on parcels smaller than one acre (i.e. is gardening allowed?).						
77	Should be .9 as plan provides that range (.9 to 2.3 acres).						
78	Current plan .9 - 1 acre already provided for.						
89	If the zoning is currently agricultural but is larger than 1 acre, then the zoning shouldn't change to allow higher density. No increased density for residential-agricultural from the minimum sizes if is currently zoned.						
90	The current definition is fine.						
91	Should be 2+ acre minimum.						
109	One acre where currently zoned, larger if currently zoned.						
111	Strawberry farms?						
112	If that is what it is today, than keep it. But don't want it required.						
114	Does not matter.						

- 122** Good rule.
- 124** Current plan is fine.
- 135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 139** What is the point? Are we trying to eliminate small horse properties and private gardens?
- 148** Why?
- 157** One acre isn't much agriculture.
- 161** Or more. Existing agricultural land. If an ag parcel exists that is already less than an acre, then it should be allowed.
- 170** Livestock and small farming (i.e. strawberries) should be permitted and encouraged. Development of lots of less than one acre should where possible provide open space suitable for farming and livestock. Clos Du Lac is an example. There are already lots of .9 acres that part of an equestrian development built back in the 50's. They should be grandfathered in to permit keeping of livestock and the ability to do so should not be lost if lot is sold.
- 172** What is it currently? What is the logic of one acre?
- 173** 2.3 should be the minimum.
- 174** I like 2.3 acre lots.
- 175** Anyone slightly familiar with agriculture knows that two acres is a very small farm. One acre is just a house with a big yard.
- 180** .9 acre or larger.
- 184** No change to existing community plan.
- 229** They should be larger- no one with one acre can pursue sustainable agriculture.
- 230** Keep definition as-is.
- 234** To be developed or to be kept as agricultural? Poorly written.
- 236** What sense does it make to place such a limit on ag usage?
- 238** Is an agricultural parcel a parcel without a structure? Or used for profit/commercial business?
- 240** Minimum should be increased to two acres.
- 243** Two and 1/2 acre,

CC&R'S SHOULD NOT RESTRICT THE KEEPING OF FARM ANIMALS WITHIN DEVELOPMENTS IF PERMITTED BY LAND USE/ZONING.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		24%	22%	17%	19%	16%	0%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
3	Cows and horses in Treelake?						
4	No.						
9	However, CCR's should not be changed after the fact as the residents bought under the existing CC&Rs that did not permit farm animals.						
11	I would want to address where these animals are housed on a property, e.g. prohibit location within # of feet to a home, common property line, etc.						
26	?						
47	CC&Rs should govern association property, trumping zoning. Those who want farm animals should have the right pursuant to zoning so land as it does not conflict with CC&Rs.						
48	Protect the original buyers and future.						
51	Areas like Hidden Valley and other rural areas were built by people wanting to keep horses, etc. These areas need to be retained.						
54	Yes, we are rural and there were farm animals before the developments came.						
55	Example- chickens (not roosters) would have a low impact/disturbance factor and could be allowed as they are in the urban cities of San Francisco and Seattle (up to 3 or 4 chickens)						
59	CC&Rs are established by the development parties. If the encroach on existing zoning ordinances, they should be reviewed by the MAC in relation to the existing plan.						
77	Because can create conflicts with neighbors if CC&Rs write out neighbors.						
86	Depends on development. Get problems when living next to smelly animals, i.e. horses. We can have them, but neighbors wouldn't like it.						
93	CC&Rs are designed as a layered set of rules, and if government decides to intrude in one area, is it opening a Pandora's box?						
107	That's why they exist.						
108	Read your CC&Rs before you buy.						
114	They provide "extra" protection for people who choose to live in that community.						
122	CC&Rs should be able to make its own rules (for new development).						
123	Which came first? CC&R's or land use zoning?						
139	Owners should know CC&R policies before buying in a community and agree.						
141	This would require further clarification.						

<b>143</b>	Owners should know restrictions of CC&Rs before choosing to live in a CC&R community. Live by CC&R policies.					
<b>148</b>	Your choice to live there.					
<b>153</b>	Buyers should know CC&Rs before they buy.					
<b>155</b>	Property owners are mutually protected.					
<b>166</b>	Variances may be appropriate in some situations.					
<b>170</b>	If the keeping of livestock is permitted in a land use/zoning it should not be changes by CC&Rs.					
<b>172</b>	Again, move if you don't like the area.					
<b>173</b>	Of course, otherwise it's houses, not horses; traffic not trees. Some HOAs/CC&Rs in suburban areas are ridiculous. In Serrano (El Dorado Hills) you must submit your backyard landscape plan to the HOA and you cannot even display a U.S. flag in front of your home.					
<b>174</b>	Stay within guidelines of the ag/res zoning. Do not overuse land with animals.					
<b>234</b>	Why have CC&Rs? The specific CC&Rs should be for each development. Allowing too many farm animals creating noise and smell (odor) is a negative impact.					
<b>238</b>	Our community did not begin with CC&Rs- people shouldn't live here if their intent is to change our community to fit their lifestyle.					
<b>240</b>	If a neighborhood wishes to restrict farm animals (or kids, motorcycles, types of trees, etc) then they should have the right to do that.					
<b>243</b>	Do not change zoning to restrict.					
<b>SPOT-ZONING SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED.</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b> <b>69%</b>	<b>Agree</b> <b>13%</b>	<b>Neutral</b> <b>10%</b>	<b>Disagree</b> <b>3%</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b> <b>4%</b> <b>Not Applicable</b> <b>2%</b>
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>						
<b>4</b>	No.					
<b>9</b>	Unless this is in the best interest of the community vs. just in the best interest of the landowner.					
<b>17</b>	True. Do not allow one lot at a time to be split and built on. In 30 years Granite Bay will become another Folsom. Do not allow on Itchy Acres or Oak Pine.					
<b>19</b>	This is happening as I write.					
<b>20</b>	Most of what I see tonight is spot zoning, not a revision of the General Plan.					
<b>24</b>	Particularly Itch Acres Road and Oak Pine Road.					
<b>26</b>	What's that?					
<b>46</b>	No spot-zoning.					
<b>47</b>	County Planning Commission & Board of Supervisors should have flexibility to study/recommend spot changes.					
<b>48</b>	Always exceptions that could dictate need for change.					



- 51** Zoning needs to be compatible with the original community plan- no changes.
- 54** Don't allow smaller lot sizes in the midst of rural area, i.e. Tanner and Del Oro developments.
- 59** Spot zoning should be reviewed by the MAC to determine if it is desirable or not.
- 62** I don't know what this is.
- 70** Maybe with documented justification.
- 77** Must be compatible. Current plan OK.
- 78** Any change in zoning must be compatible to surrounding lots.
- 83** Must be compatible with surrounding properties.
- 86** Why not?
- 89** No spot zoning. The update process should not include any spot rezoning. The plan should be updated to ensure there is no additional commercial along Douglas in GB, 300' setback can never be changes, no additional traffic lights on Douglas to avoid cut-through traffic, no changes to current codes/rules for monument signs, no density changes to parcels if inconsistent to contiguous properties.
- 90** I am not sure what spot-zoning is. In general, it is not good to stick commercial business in the middle of residential areas unless the residents initiate the desire for such businesses (not business owner).
- 93** I think this is already not allowed by State law.
- 98** Small homes. 2200 sq.ft. not 10k to 12k sq.ft.
- 109** Spot zoning development that is left to its own will destroy a community.
- 122** Tend to agree but some exceptions. Rezone larger areas, they don't have to split.
- 135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 139** And "block zoning" should not be imposed against the wishes of adjacent property owners in any community.
- 141** I'm not certain what the term implies.
- 143** Should not be allowed if the majority of owners are opposed.
- 154** Keep with the present plan on zoning.
- 164** Spot zoning should be allowed. Things have changed in the last 20 years. Residents' needs have also changed.
- 165** Absolutely.
- 170** Spot zoning should not be allowed. In areas of larger lots, having a small lot can cause problems especially if there is agriculture.
- 172** Agree, it starts small and then spreads.
- 173** Spot-zoning is the very antithesis of a community plan and leads to ugly results.
- 174** No thorns in the rose patch. No rose in the thorn patch. No high-density next to ag/res.
- 184** No change to existing community plan.

234	Stop the foolishness of allowing a property owner to subdivide into smaller parcels when the infrastructure is not present. This is a rural community. With a recessionary time, this is not the time to give in for the enrichment of a few that promotes spot-zoning, i.e. Itchy Acres.
236	Uhler said he supports this but he orchestrated the first spot-rezone of the existing community plan with the carwash/retail on Douglas west of Lake Center thus violating every precept of the existing community plan. Given that, how can spot-rezoning be avoided?
240	This is a vague statement but there should be consistency with adjacent parcels.

THE PLAN SHOULD IDENTIFY AREAS FOR MEDIUM/HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL USES BASED ON PROXIMITY TO PUBLIC SERVICES AND TRANSPORTATION NETWORKS.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	22%	35%	13%	10%	20%	0%

Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)	
1	No high or medium-density.
4	Yes.
11	These types of development don't enhance or maintain overall rural feel in Granite Bay.
12	Let the market, and not Placer County, decide what can be built and where.
21	I don't want any high-density residential areas- we have no transportation networks.
39	No high-density areas.
40	No high-density areas.
43	And neighbor lot size.
46	No high density.
47	High-density in commercial corridors.
50	Rural community of Granite Bay is not place for medium/high-density residential.
51	We do not need high-density residential areas in Granite Bay.
59	Proposals for medium/high-density developments should be reviewed by the MAC and residents/businesses in the area.
60	This area lacks the infrastructure to manage high density traffic generation, public safety, and other public and commercial services.
66	High-density should never be permitted.
68	No high density.
73	There should be little or no high-density in Granite Bay.
74	Granite Bay should avoid any high-density residential uses as high-density does not fit the character of this community. Granite Bay does not have the public services and public transportation to support high-density housing.

THE PLAN SHOULD IDENTIFY AREAS FOR MEDIUM/HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL USES BASED ON PROXIMITY TO PUBLIC SERVICES AND TRANSPORTATION NETWORKS.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	22%	35%	13%	10%	20%	0%

[illegible]

1	No high or medium-density.
4	Yes.
11	These types of development don't enhance or maintain overall rural feel in Granite Bay.
12	Let the market, and not Placer County, decide what can be built and where.
21	I don't want any high-density residential areas- we have no transportation networks.
39	No high-density areas.
40	No high-density areas.
43	And neighbor lot size.
46	No high density.
47	High-density in commercial corridors.
50	Rural community of Granite Bay is not place for medium/high-density residential.
51	We do not need high-density residential areas in Granite Bay.
59	Proposals for medium/high-density developments should be reviewed by the MAC and residents/businesses in the area.
60	This area lacks the infrastructure to manage high density traffic generation, public safety, and other public and commercial services.
66	High-density should never be permitted.
68	No high density.
73	There should be little or no high-density in Granite Bay.
74	Granite Bay should avoid any high-density residential uses as high-density does not fit the character of this community. Granite Bay does not have the public services and public transportation to support high-density housing.

- 77** Done in current plan.
- 78** Already done.
- 82** There should be no medium/high density housing. That is called Roseville.
- 89** Leave plan as is- no changes.
- 90** This already seems to be properly in place with the current plan.
- 91** Granite Bay is a rural community. High-density does not benefit anyone. High-density is already available on Sierra College/Hazel. Please just maintain the rural environment.
- 93** Public transportation opportunities should be enhanced over time.
- 102** Not for Granite Bay public transportation.
- 105** Medium/high-density should not be allowed here because it would completely change the character of Granite Bay.
- 111** Sewer.
- 112** Should not change to accommodate high-density.
- 122** If you build it, they will come.
- 123** Current plan is fine.
- 124** Current plan does this and in practice this is the case. No need to change.
- 127** No high density.
- 130** Keep plan as it is.
- 131** Keep principles of current Granite Bay plan. Do not change.
- 135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 136** Medium/high-density residential should not be permitted in a rural residential setting.
- 138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 139** Within the parameters of the reduced holding capacity.
- 141** Recognizing the tremendous increase in auto traffic on Douglas Blvd and Auburn Folsom Blvd. over past ten years, continued growth will bring additional pressure on these streets and others.
- 143** "Holding capacity" needs to remain at 23,000.
- 146** We do not need high-density areas.
- 154** High-density should be on main arteries and within the 23,000 residents or fewer.
- 157** No high density.
- 158** No high density housing.
- 166** Less about proximity to public services, more about transportation networks and also parking.
- 170** Plan should identify appropriate sites along with support of services and transportation, especially public transportation.
- 172** There should be a correlation.
- 173** You assume the reader already agrees with medium/high density. We came here to avoid it. The "transportation network" if you can it that, is in Roseville where medium-high density is a fit.

<b>174</b>	Leave as is.					
<b>175</b>	We don't need any more medium/high-density.					
<b>180</b>	High-density only in currently zoned commercial properties. Medium-density should only be considered right near major roads and be minimum .25 acre in size.					
<b>184</b>	No change to existing community plan.					
<b>229</b>	Not if it allows for higher-density development.					
<b>230</b>	Leave as is now.					
<b>233</b>	No high-density.					
<b>236</b>	The existing plan already does this. No changes.					
<b>238</b>	This statement suggests the building of medium/high-density residential which I don't support.					
<b>241</b>	A limited amount of medium/high-density residences might be helpful.					
<b>242</b>	No medium or high-density. Stay with the plan.					
<b>243</b>	No developers.					
<b>245</b>	We're not in favor of new high-density uses, but if allowed, yes, it should be proximate to resources and transportation.					
<b>PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (PD) REGULATIONS SHOULD BE REVIEWED, AND IF NECESSARY, REVISED TO PROVIDE FOR ADDITIONAL COMMUNITY BENEFITS.</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
		<b>22%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>7%</b>
						<b>0%</b>
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>						
<b>3</b>	What sorts of benefits?					
<b>10</b>	Define "if necessary."					
<b>12</b>	Current PD regulations are adequate.					
<b>27</b>	Only upon an agreed schedule.					
<b>43</b>	Absolutely. Used now for higher density only.					
<b>51</b>	There needs to be no changes to our community plan.					
<b>58</b>	This depends on the definition of "community benefits." Needs more explanation or be more specific.					
<b>59</b>	This is a function of the MAC and should continue to be so.					
<b>62</b>	We are not in favor of any revision for high-density development.					
<b>68</b>	What are you saying?					
<b>69</b>	Too vague. This could lead to loopholes in the community plan as it is written.					
<b>73</b>	This should be considered beforehand.					

- 76** More to community- less to developer.
- 77** PD's generally take the ability to keep animals out and are often incompatible with existing neighborhood. Also usually gated development and open spaces not available to public. Feel developers get most of benefits- PDs abused. Primary reason for PDs often overlooked.
- 78** I feel this is being abused simply so developers can increase density.
- 83** Current benefits are not being implemented and should be given more consideration.
- 89** Leave plan as is- no changes.
- 90** Vague. Independent review and plenty of current resident input should help decide what "community benefit" is. Avoid developer/realtor/bank profiteering at the expense of keeping Granite Bay a rural community.
- 91** Community benefits are in close proximity to GB. The community should support those benefits in Roseville, etc. so that GB may utilize them. Duplicating services that are already available is a waste.
- 93** Anything to consciously link neighborhoods to communitywide interests should be encouraged.
- 105** What benefits do you have in mind? Once you let us know, we will comment.
- 123** Current plan is fine.
- 128** No. Land owners purchased property with knowledge of zoning surrounding their property. No surprises. Criteria for development- any land use change should be compatible in size with surrounding properties.
- 129** Leave it alone.
- 130** Keep plan as it is.
- 135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 141** Define "additional community benefits."
- 146** We don't need more development.
- 165** I'm not familiar with these regulations.
- 166** Examples include parks, community/rec center, churches.
- 173** Emphasis on the "if."
- 174** Leave as is. Money is hard to come by- stop spending money.
- 180** Do not think "The Enclave" is compatible with neighboring parcels. I don't care how much open space is set aside.
- 236** This is ambiguous. What "community benefits?" The existing plan is adequate.
- 238** I don't know what the planned development regulations are- but as I don't want additional buildings and community benefits are not defined, I can't agree to this.
- 240** Open space should not be behind locked gates.
- 242** Stay with the plan.
- 243** What does this mean? Who decides- developers or developer friends?
- 245** What does this mean? Too vague.



PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS SHOULD ALLOW FOR INCREASED DENSITY (OVER WHAT IS CURRENTLY ALLOWED) IF ADDITIONAL OPEN SPACE IS PROVIDED.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	8%	13%	18%	23%	35%	1%

#### Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)

- 4 No.
- 8 Sounds OK, but what is meant by increased density? Do not make density of residential homes too close. Kids cannot even practice their drums, pianos, etc.
- 10 The size of the developments should be regulated. They should be small.
- 21 We don't want increased density at all. It leads to more crowding and traffic.
- 34 Would depend on plan.
- 43 For public use.
- 47 Planning Commission/Board of Supervisors should have discretion.
- 51 There should be no more changing of land uses for increased density.
- 55 No development = even more open space. Density should be in keeping with neighboring existing development.
- 58 How can there be additional open space when new developments are planned?
- 59 This should be reviewed by the MAC against the current plan on a case-by-case basis.
- 60 This area is not suitable for high density. Any open space acquired under such arrangements will inevitably be unusable, unattractive and remnant land.
- 66 Never.
- 68 No high density.
- 77 Already get too many benefits at expense of residents.
- 78 Currently increased density is allowed only if open space is provided.
- 89 No increased density over what is currently allowed.
- 90 This sounds like tearing down one area and giving it "back to nature" will then allow for building apartments/condos or other high-density. I can't imagine this is practical or desirable. This is confusing. I don't want increased density at all.
- 93 How does this link to reduced holding capacity, services available, etc.?
- 105 That would change the character of the community. Open space is fine, but not high-density. We do not want to be another Roseville.
- 109 "Additional" open space is a physical impossibility, they just don't make it anymore.
- 111 Must see the plan.
- 124 Current plan is fine. MAC can review case-by-case.
- 127 No.

- 136** Open space should be mandatory for PD.
- 139** Impossible to determine until you have a plan.
- 141** Not if it means increased population growth. The semi-rural character has been degraded tremendously over past 10 years.
- 143** Unclear until the plan is viewed by the public.
- 154** Neutral until a plan is provided.
- 157** Swamps classify as "open space?"
- 165** Just means smaller lots and more crowding.
- 166** Depends on impact to transportation networks and adequacy thereof.
- 173** So, we should split a four-acre lot, create a two-acre park on one side and put up a three-story building on the other two acres? No thanks.
- 174** No.
- 175** We have enough "parks" and "open spaces" within developments few of which have any rural character.
- 236** Existing plan and County regs cover this. No change.
- 240** Agree provided that the open space is accessible to the community (i.e. not in a gated community, fenced in).
- 243** No.
- 245** This has always been the case- but within reasonable limits with regards to increasing density.



OPEN SPACE AREAS WITHIN PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS SHOULD BE ACCESSIBLE TO THE PUBLIC.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		<b>27%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
<b>4</b>	Yes.						
<b>17</b>	Must be.						
<b>34</b>	Too many variables to make an overall decision.						
<b>41</b>	Not necessary to give outsiders and "interlopers" walk-through access at the expense of security of families within that new development.						
<b>50</b>	Useable open space areas of certain minimum size should be publicly accessible.						
<b>59</b>	This depends on the nature of the development and needs to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as is now being done by the MAC.						
<b>60</b>	Visible, yes. Accessible, no.						
<b>64</b>	If open space is maintained by public.						
<b>68</b>	Rural density planning.						
<b>70</b>	This would help in developing connectivity between "communities" (developments).						
<b>78</b>	This is a given.						
<b>89</b>	No gated developments. All currently gated neighborhoods should have their gates opened 6Am - 6PM and their pedestrian gates always unlocked so kids can bike/walk through the neighborhoods.						
<b>90</b>	The exception to this is if a natural area needs to be secluded for protection of certain fragile plants/animals.						
<b>93</b>	Only if PD bonuses are included.						
<b>98</b>	Larger homes in GB are fenced to keep the public out. Eureka and Barton case in point. Bella Terra also case in point. Main gates at Silver Wood North but the public is afraid or not aware of use or not.						
<b>109</b>	How is open space defined?						
<b>110</b>	Only if open space is maintained by the County.						
<b>122</b>	Private = private. Same with private roads.						
<b>124</b>	One size doesn't fit all- planning process should address.						
<b>136</b>	Rural-density planning.						
<b>141</b>	Must define "planned developments."						
<b>161</b>	Uncertain.						
<b>165</b>	This many not always work out and should vary by project.						

<b>166</b>	Only if "open space" is defined as public space to be maintained and used.						
<b>170</b>	Especially trails which should be required wherever a reasonable possibility of addition to a network exists, trails should be planned on site and not just along roads. Trails could be set between lots, rear setbacks of other single-family residential sites.						
<b>174</b>	Open are- if private property is the responsibility of the owner, not the government.						
<b>236</b>	Existing plan should cover this more clearly in any update.						
<b>243</b>	No development.						
<b>244</b>	If it (open space) is privately funded, no. If publicly funded, yes.						
<b>IN AN EFFORT TO ATTRACT BUSINESSES AND CREATE SUCCESSFUL COMMERCIAL CENTERS, OFFER INCENTIVES TO REVITALIZE EXISTING COMMERCIAL AREAS (I.E. SIERRA COLLEGE BLVD., DOUGLAS BLVD. AND AUBURN-FOLSOM ROAD).</b>		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		<b>13%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
<b>4</b>	No.						
<b>10</b>	Business buildings and landscaping should be reviewed to preserve beauty of the area.						
<b>11</b>	These "centers" should encourage social interaction to attract users to say and spend money. These outdoor spaces should not be on top of a hot parking lot or next to mosquito-ridden sloughs.						
<b>12</b>	Let the owners of commercial areas revitalize their property. Their incentive to revitalize their property is to continue to make it a viable and attractive building and if they don't they could lose tenants and ultimately business. They need to stand on their own and not rely on or expect government largess. If they need government funding to something as basic as improving their property they shouldn't be in business.						
<b>20</b>	No public funds for private development that includes tax breaks and waivers.						
<b>34</b>	Need a business wizard to figure out why southeast corners of those intersections aren't making it.						
<b>36</b>	As long as this means "as an alternative to building new"- revitalizing what is already there is definitely the better choice.						
<b>43</b>	Only at these corners.						
<b>46</b>	No more commercial along Douglas.						
<b>51</b>	No more commercial development along Douglas except revitalizing existing buildings. No more new development. Quarry Pond should never have been built.						
<b>52</b>	Market does not see incentives as a form of growing a low-density market.						
<b>55</b>	Better than building new commercial spaces when there is already so much underutilized/empty commercial centers.						
<b>58</b>	There are plenty of relevant commercial centers in adjacent communities (i.e. Roseville, Folsom, Citrus Heights and Rocklin).						
<b>59</b>	This needs to be determined by the MAC. Incentivizing new business does not necessarily mean revitalization- again any new business must be evaluated as to its potential for success by the MAC and aired to the citizens.						

- 60 Not needed. Will lead to over-commercialization of traffic corridors at the expense of scenic thoroughfares.
- 62 Don't want any new commercial development.
- 66 Not a good idea.
- 68 We do not want to attract businesses in Granite Bay. There is enough in Roseville and Folsom.
- 74 Business within the community should benefit this community and should stand on their own as to costs and profitability.
- 77 Depends on incentives. Should not apply to anything on Douglas corridor.
- 78 Only to existing commercial centers. No new ones, as described in plan, and no cash.
- 82 We should not be trying to attract new businesses.
- 83 Only to existing.
- 89 No additional commercial along Douglas Blvd. and Auburn Folsom. Areas currently zoned for commercial is enough.
- 90 Only to the point that existing older businesses can remodel and improve their structures.
- 93 Start with increased signage approvals for targeted areas of corner of Auburn Folsom (or Fuller) and Douglas.
- 105 We do not want to attract more business. There are plenty of those in Roseville.
- 109 Revitalization is best left to needs such as market, aesthetics, community requirements.
- 124 Current plan addresses this.
- 129 Main policy goal: Keep Granite Bay rural and residential.
- 130 Keep Granite Bay rural.
- 131 Keep Granite Bay rural and residential.
- 132 No. Why do we want to attract businesses when the planning goal and policy is to keep Granite Bay rural and residential?
- 135 No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 136 We do not want to attract businesses. We have plenty of services in Roseville and Folsom. No commercial building on Douglas Blvd.
- 138 No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 157 The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors have already overridden the vote of residents to support carwash, the now-defunct Quarry Ponds and the "garage condos" greatly impacting the quality of life for those living around them by 24-hour access.
- 158 Leave everything alone.
- 165 Try to get California Family Fitness to open a location at Douglas & Sierra. It would be great.
- 166 Depends on what is meant by "incentives."
- 172 Too vague to evaluate.
- 173 I am only in favor of incentives to fill up existing vacancies with businesses that fit with the character of Granite Bay, and do not jeopardize current merchants or professionals. Do not build more commercial or office space.
- 174 Leave as is. You are thinking too much.
- 175 Until these areas are at capacity (i.e. no vacancies), no new commercial should be considered.
- 177 Focus should be on incentives- the use of existing commercial buildings and centers.
- 178 Only existing.

- 180** Incentives should be tied to community input in the redevelopment. No cash incentives upfront. Reduced environmental review OK. Reduced property taxes for several years OK.
- 184** No change to existing community plan. What are the incentives?
- 229** Not sure of what you mean by revitalization. Do you mean existing commercial space? Infrastructure? It seems that we have adequate space now, especially if we reduce maximum buildout to 23,000. New space just seems to run old spaces out of business.
- 234** Incentives could include lower taxes and building/development fees.
- 236** Granite Bay is not a shopping destination for local or external shoppers. Commercial has always struggled in Granite Bay. Do not compound this with rezones to commercial anywhere.
- 238** What kind of incentives?
- 240** What kind of incentives? Difficult to respond to this without knowing what is being considered. Opposed to any form of business subsidies.
- 242** No trust.
- 243** No.

LIMIT NEW COMMERCIAL USES ALONG DOUGLAS BOULEVARD.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		54%	12%	6%	7%	20%	0%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
4	Yes.						
10	Improve agricultural guidelines.						
12	We do not want another Folsom, Roseville, or Rocklin with wall-to-wall strip malls.						
18	Don't spoil Douglas Boulevard.						
33	Please- we love this community and the Douglas corridor. The commercial properties should be reduced not expanded.						
35	No more commercial along Douglas.						
36	We don't need any more commercial use in Granite Bay.						
43	No more.						
46	Not allow.						
48	Those existing should have have a 300' setback.						
49	Enough now.						
51	No more commercial development on Douglas. No car wash.						
52	Too much commercial on Douglas now providing an oversupply for population.						
54	We have too many empty buildings now.						
59	Again- any new projects need to be reviewed and accepted/rejected by the MAC.						
64	Let the market dictate uses.						
68	Absolutely.						
73	The area was not designed to accommodate more commercial businesses (within) the Douglas Blvd. It is a rural area that is growing but it's not. Greenback Blvd.						
74	Some areas along Douglas seem only useful as commercial locations						
75	Existing commercial areas have high vacancies. Don't waste our precious land resource. Keep the 300' setback.						
78	Limit to existing GB Community Plan.						
82	Absolutely not. Why don't we put the commercial business in Granite Bay Hills and Wexford?						
83	Depends.						
89	There is enough commercial along Douglas Blvd. The current bldgs. Have been vacant for years- even prior to the recession.						
90	Definitely. We do not need or want more commercial. There are plenty of convenient commercial resources in nearby Roseville and Rocklin.						

- 93** Absolutely. Market area is limited and quality of development at Auburn Folsom (to Fuller) and Douglas core area will be constrained by any new commercial along Douglas, particularly retail or service. Also, more commercial along Douglas would/could require more stoplights, etc., thereby reducing traffic capacity of Douglas and causing more traffic on Eureka and Olive Ranch.
- 105** Limit new commercial, because as is, Douglas is stop and go all the time. We need to keep our greenbelt on Douglas, and if anything, minimize the amount of traffic.
- 115** Traffic increase in last seven year enormous. If development continues, Douglas will soon need more lanes and Granite Bay will lose its rural character.
- 116** Already have too many vacant commercial buildings along Douglas Boulevard.
- 122** Tend to agree.
- 123** See current plan.
- 124** Current plan should not be changed.
- 127** I was at the meeting when Jack Lish approved the Raley shopping center (20ish years ago) and we all know what happened to the Jumbo shopping center. And what about the center across from Safeway. Granite Bay has more commercial than it needs. Oh, and Whispering Pines and the corner of Eureka Road and Sierra College.
- 135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 136** Limit or restrict new commercial- not needed or warranted- will cause traffic jams and higher density population.
- 138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 157** I'm sure the developers have new ideas for destroying the "scenic corridors."
- 158** For sure.
- 160** Review on a case-by-case basis.
- 166** This corridor has great potential for certain low-density commercial development such as doctor/professional offices where visitors are few at a time. Such additions would be beneficial to Granite Bay within reasonable planning considerations.
- 173** And keep the 300' setback or we will be a Sunrise Mall/Greenback Lane with traffic moving through like a freeway.
- 174** Yes. Too many businesses screws up traffic flow.
- 184** No change to existing community plan.
- 230** Comment is too vague to judge intent.
- 234** No. It's our main through artery. It should be on Douglas.
- 236** Douglas is our community. Don't destroy it further. The carwash was bad enough.
- 238** I don't want any new commercial use.
- 240** Provide transitions (i.e. professional office space) between existing commercial and residential.
- 242** Limit to "0."
- 243** Limit to zero. None. Nada.
- 244** Establish minimum occupancy requirements to be met before allowing new development.
- 246** Disallow new development.

PROFESSIONAL OFFICE LAND USES SHOULD BE REQUIRED AS BUFFERS BETWEEN COMMERCIAL AREAS AND RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		9%	27%	28%	23%	11%	2%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
1	No further offices.						
3	If there is a need for these- there seems to be a lot of unoccupied space.						
4	No.						
9	"Required" is too limiting of a word to use. They may be desired. However, they may not always be the best choice as a buffer.						
10	Yes, if tastefully done.						
11	Like doctors' offices? Perhaps I have been misinformed, but these types of businesses have more in and out traffic daily than typical commercial areas.						
30	No new developments.						
43	Good idea- depends on site.						
46	Only if low rise.						
51	We would not need buffer areas if commercial areas were limited to Auburn Folsom and Sierra College- buffer areas may be needed in these areas.						
55	There should be land buffers between commercial and residential developments, not just an ugly block wall.						
59	This may or may not be a beneficial approach. Let any proposal be aired through the MAC.						
62	Open space should be the buffer.						
64	Only If market can absorb such use.						
68	This is a trick question. No new commercial professional or residential needed.						
77	Already part of plan.						
78	Already in plan.						
83	Depends.						
89	If the parcel is already zoned commercial, then it should be designated as office as opposed to retail. No new commercial zoning than current.						
93	Buffering is a useful planning principle, but it should be site specific, and not limited to any particular land use combination.						
105	This is a trick question: you're damned if you do, and damned if you don't. Please get the message: We do not want more commercial of any kind, nor high-density residential. So there should not be a need for more professional offices. There are too many already empty.						
112	Not sure the impact or benefit.						

124	Current plan is fine.						
131	Keep current plan principles.						
132	Why?						
135	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
136	If needed- but open space is much more preferred. No new commercial building or professional building.						
138	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
157	Better than garage condos- open 24 hours. Don't need office space.						
164	When possible this makes sense. It should also be balanced with demand for professional office space and the type of commercial development being proposed.						
166	"Required" may not be beneficial or necessary in some cases. More specific planning should result in appropriate solutions.						
170	Too much limitation of flexibility should be decided on case by case basis, consistent with zoning.						
172	Open space should be required as buffers.						
173	No new additional space is needed.						
176	Douglas Blvd. already has too much office space.						
179	Too detailed to be in a plan.						
180	Do not believe this is necessary. Depends on the location and layout. Case-by-case with the neighbors directly affected with the most say.						
184	No change to existing community plan.						
236	Professional office can be used but vegetation buffers work fine if enforced.						
238	There should be nothing but green area between commercial and residential.						
240	Professional office use is a good buffer but should not be a requirement.						
242	Office buildings as a buffer?						
243	No developers.						
244	Maintain open space/public park/community service as buffer.						
<b>LARGE CHURCHES AND COMMUNITY CENTERS IN GRANITE BAY SHOULD BE LIMITED IN SIZE.</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b> <b>41%</b>	<b>Agree</b> <b>24%</b>	<b>Neutral</b> <b>17%</b>	<b>Disagree</b> <b>12%</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b> <b>5%</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b> <b>0%</b>
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
1	No additional churches.						
2	Yes. No mega-churches.						



4 No new ones.

8 I attend a big church. The flow of traffic doesn't seem to bother anyone between church services. Granite Bay is making a mountain out of a mole hill. Members use main arteries, not residential streets. Churches help stabilize communities, help children and everyone.

10 How big or how small? How do you decide? Design is key, not size.

12 To the extent they are permitted in the current plan.

15 Too late.

16 It's a bit late for this.

26 Are you going to tear down Bayside? Too late.

35 Bayside Church is way too big. The draw of people is not wanted.

37 Yes. No mega-churches.

41 Large is good. Mega churches and neighborhood churches all belong in Granite Bay. We must not remove the churchgoers choice of place of worship.

43 Some are regional- need to be local.

48 Depends on access path.

49 The traffic impact is terrible. Please restrict the size.

51 No more mega churches.

55 Don't need big boxes.

66 We don't need any more.

70 The government shall not make any laws prohibiting religion or the free exercise thereof....

77 Yes, shouldn't be regional in size. Are other buildings such as schools, libraries, etc. for public use.

78 No more "Baysides" with all that traffic. No regional centers.

83 In keeping with the rural character of the community, the needs of the community should be considered, not regional.

89 Churches and community centers should be designed to serve the community and not as a regional center.

92 Other considerations should be location on a major arterial, design to blend in with its surroundings, plus social, cultural and community benefits provided.

93 Large churches have a role in meeting social service needs, as government cannot do this alone. "There is an enormous need to build...I call it the person. And something that's more than self-respect; it's also the awareness that there's something beyond you, and something beyond the moment, and something that is not only greater than you but different from you. That is why what you are doing in the churches is so incredibly important." - Peter Drucker

105 I have a huge one in my backyard, and wish it had never been built. It's been very problematic.

107 Stick to the current plan.

109 And number.

111 Covered in community plan.

122 What is large?

- 123 Keep current plan.
- 124 Current processes have worked fine in past- keep current processes.
- 126 What is the financial benefit to the community? Stop these churches. Lack of control. Speeding on Auburn Folsom is out of control now. Animals are being killed on road.
- 128 We have enough.
- 136 Again, no need for additional buildings to increase traffic patterns.
- 139 For traffic reasons primarily.
- 141 Enough is enough.
- 143 Start now.
- 154 It's in the community plan. Stay with the existing plan.
- 157 Too late for that- Bayside.
- 165 See attached request submitted 6/3/9, 7/13/9 and 10/28/9.
- 166 Neither these nor other similar uses should be "limited" as a policy, other than normal planning considerations as otherwise commented on. Churches and community centers are safe, healthy, and beneficial assets to Granite bay and serve out community well by many positive elements.
- 170 Case-by-case. Fair-share of regional assets.
- 173 Please no "community centers." This goes hand-in-hand with urban/suburban incorporation. No thanks to incorporation if that's where this is all heading. There are enough large churches for a small community.
- 174 OK as is.
- 175 These institutions benefit the community.
- 179 Too specific. Large is not equivalent to bad for the community. In many cases large brings benefit to the community. Work together, and serve together.
- 184 No change to existing community plan.
- 232 This idea is a little late.
- 234 Bayside Church and Adventure seem to be pretty good examples of successful developments.
- 235 These uses are more appropriate in Roseville city limits.
- 236 We have enough.
- 238 I can't change the size of the churches- we don't have a community center and I don't want a community center.
- 240 Sized to fit Granite Bay needs only.
- 245 But depends on location- Sierra College already has a number of large churches. So, one or two more would not be a blight.

THE 300 FOOT SETBACK REQUIREMENT SHOULD REMAIN IN PLACE FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES ALONG THE SOUTH SIDE OF DOUGLAS BLVD.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	55%	12%	3%	7%	22%	0%

Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)						
4	Yes.					
11	This should be applied to all development on Douglas.					
20	We don't want Watt Avenue to be the entrance to our home.					
24	And for commercial properties as well.					
30	Yes.					
43	Yes.					
46	Should be extending to commercial and professional. Do not need another Greenback.					
47	150-250'					
48	This is extremely unfair to those property owners when there is already development on Douglas without the restriction.					
52	Too many issues with accidents getting off Douglas.					
59	This needs to be reviewed in-depth by the MAC.					
64	Some areas 150' setback may be sufficient.					
69	And commercial properties. This 300' setback agreement applies mainly to commercial properties on Douglas. This should be included in the revised plan.					
73	Private landowners are restricted in land use of their own property.					
78	Also any other properties.					
80	As well as commercial properties.					
89	Oppose any change to the 300' set-back policy, which has been part of our existing 20-year plan. This has kept the "greenery" along Douglas Blvd. in GB (past Sierra College Blvd). I understand 20 years ago landowners were awarded extra density in exchange for keeping the natural terrain intact, and many of them "sold" or transferred their rights, which were used to add density to other GB development. 300' setback requirement applied to commercial and residential development along the south side of Douglas.					
93	This has worked well, particularly with density transfer provisions in place.					
106	Absolutely no changes in plan.					
107	And should not change for commercial.					
111	Including commercial properties.					
114	Commercial also.					
123	For all properties- commercial and residential.					
124	For all properties, right?					
130	Should pertain to commercial and residential.					
131	Residential and commercial.					
132	Residential, commercial and professional development should all respect the 300' setback.					

- 133** Commercial too.
- 135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 139** And commercial properties as well.
- 143** Commercial must be included as well.
- 149** Also commercial properties.
- 154** And commercial properties.
- 155** Commercial too.
- 157** Quarry Ponds destroyed that anyway.
- 164** It should be more like 500 feet.
- 165** All properties.
- 172** And apply to any businesses.
- 173** For all properties.
- 174** For new- not for existing- structures for low-key business.
- 184** And commercial properties. No change to existing community plan.
- 229** This is perhaps the single most important issue- changing the zoning and redevelopment it will alter the appearance of Granite bay dramatically and in a negative way.
- 236** The carwash project converted 700' of 300' setback to commercial. County staff promoted that rezone vehemently. How can we trust you to follow any plan when you violated every precept of the existing plan with that disgraceful disregard for the residents of Granite Bay and the existing community plan?
- 240** Should be for residential and commercials to avoid a "strip" look and preserve the rural ambience.
- 242** All properties- residential and commercial- misleading question.
- 243** No change in setbacks anywhere in Granite Bay.

COMMUNITY DESIGN						
THE COMMUNITY DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR GRANITE BAY SHOULD BE UPDATED.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	13%	23%	22%	13%	28%	0%
Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)						
<div> <div>4</div> <div>No.</div> </div> <div> <div>8</div> <div>I don't know.</div> </div>						

**30** Fine as is.  
**34** Wouldn't hurt if experts in the various fields reviewed to see if update needed, e.g. third lane on Douglas, types of trees for landscaping; there may be new knowledge or changed circumstances.  
**36** Maybe "looked at" but not necessarily a "need."  
**43** Maybe.  
**51** The design guidelines should not be changed.  
**54** It has been recognized as an outstanding example of community design- let's not change it for change sake  
**59** Just review any new structures against the current plan.  
**60** Have no idea what they are.  
**62** I would like the plans to remain the same.  
**66** Not necessary.  
**69** I see no need to revise the community plan at this time.  
**77** Depends on what is proposed.  
**78** Not needed.  
**89** Leave plan as is- no changes.  
**90** The current policy is excellent.  
**93** "Should be updated" is non-directional. What we have now works well.  
**104** The Granite Bay Community Plan has served us well for 20 years.  
**105** They are fine as they are.  
**106** Money should not be used for this purpose.  
**107** Not necessary.  
**109** If found to be desired by the community generally.  
**111** Not necessary; the present plan is exceptional.  
**114** Current plan very adequate.  
**122** Plan for next 20 years, not for last.  
**129** Keep as is.  
**130** Keep as is.  
**131** Keep as is. Keep current Granite Bay plan intact.  
**132** Keep Granite Bay plan as is.  
**133** Keep plan intact.  
**135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.  
**136** There is nothing wrong with the current design.  
**138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.  
**139** Present plan is excellent.  
**141** Have never read current community design guidelines, so can't respond.

143	Leave it alone.						
148	Why?						
149	Not necessary.						
150	The present plan is exceptional.						
154	It's fine in its present state.						
161	Uncertain what the current guidelines are.						
165	They may need to be reviewed and not necessarily updated.						
166	As a byproduct of this process.						
172	Would need to understand why.						
173	Again? This just happened through committee.						
174	Leave it alone- stop spending money.						
175	This was just finished by the "Douglas Corridor Committee."						
180	Only if approved by the local MAC, not by the Board of Supervisors.						
184	No change to existing community plan.						
230	Can't judge since don't know the current design guidelines.						
234	What are other metros areas in Orange and San Diego counties doing with their General Plans?						
236	Don't know what is being proposed here.						
241	Never was sent the original community design plan so can't comment on this.						
243	To what?						
244	The community design guidelines should be updated by local community group/residents of Granite Bay. Not by County.						
<b>THE GRANITE BAY MAC ENDORSED "DOUGLAS BLVD. CORRIDOR DESIGN GUIDELINES" SHOULD BE INCORPORATED INTO THE COMMUNITY PLAN.</b>		Strongly Agree <b>13%</b>	Agree <b>16%</b>	Neutral <b>35%</b>	Disagree <b>8%</b>	Strongly Disagree <b>27%</b>	Not Applicable <b>0%</b>
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
1	No further development.						
11	Don't know what this is.						
17	The MAC is not an elected body. They are representatives of the Supervisor that appointed them.						
34	Scenic corridor along Douglas Boulevard: If MAC design guidelines complement these in the present community plan, would agree. But don't know current MAC position.						
43	300' setback yes.						
48	Do not know about them.						

51 We need to stop planting vegetation that requires a lot of water. Also, stop watering on rainy days. Get rid of tall plants near intersections, they block the view of traffic. Also get rid of Sycamore trees- they are very dirty and get mildew on leaves. Branches are also brittle.

54 I'm not sure what these are- the MAC has often not supported the rural nature of our community.

60 Words in search of a meaning; what is this?

62 Don't know what this is.

66 We don't know the guidelines- need more info.

68 What are guidelines? Be more specific.

78 What are the guidelines?

86 Too many rules, best to leave to Planning Department.

93 I was a member of the MAC committee that developed those guidelines. Notice they were not rules to destroy design initiative, but guidelines to define community values and "look and feel." Thus, developers have an opportunity to understand our community anticipations prior to starting work.

105 These guidelines need to be mailed to the community so we know what they are.

106 Not sure what these design standards say.

107 Not familiar with referenced guidelines.

108 ?

111 Have not seen the guidelines.

114 ?

122 Requires study.

123 No change needed.

124 No change needed.

135 No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.

136 If this refers to the center divide landscaping, then yes. Not sure what the guidelines are.

138 No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.

139 Not familiar with "guidelines."

141 Don't know what current guidelines are.

143 The "design guidelines" are not public- why is this item asked to be rated?

148 ?

149 Have not seen the guidelines.

154 Don't know the guidelines.

155 ?

156 ?

157 Only if it follows old community plan.

<b>164</b>	I don't know. What would this achieve.
<b>165</b>	I have not seen these so cannot comment.
<b>166</b>	Should be evaluated for incorporation as a result of this process, and only if they are consistent with the updated plan. Otherwise they first need to be updated before incorporating.
<b>172</b>	Need to see first.
<b>184</b>	No change to existing community plan.
<b>236</b>	I agree but I'm not sure why. Planning promoted and approved two-story for the 700' Douglas carwash project, ignoring the existing guidelines.
<b>238</b>	The endorsed plan is not part of the survey- How can I answer this?
<b>241</b>	?
<b>243</b>	No.
<b>245</b>	I helped write them. :)



SIGN REGULATIONS FOR THE GRANITE BAY AREA SHOULD BE REVIEWED AND UPDATED.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		17%	33%	18%	14%	17%	0%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
1	Enforce existing signage.						
2	No regulations now for trailers or portable buildings and signs for promotional offices such as the Granite Bay storage condos.						
3	Signs should be low, small, tasteful.						
4	Yes.						
8	If necessary.						
12	Current regulations are adequate.						
36	The sign that is on Auburn Folsom Blvd. between Douglas Blvd. and Joe Rogers (the old 'Spoons' restaurant) detracts from the look of the community. It's a nice looking business but the sign should not be lit up at night. Looks cheap.						
43	Enforced.						
51	There should be no new, large, lit signs.						
54	I think they should be enforced.						
55	And enforced.						
59	Review individual proposals.						
62	Not if it means bigger signs.						
69	They are adequate as stated in the current plan.						
77	Should enforce what we have as they are probably adequate.						
78	And should be enforced.						
89	Leave plan as is- no changes.						
90	Keep Granite Bay as rural as possible- use existing policy.						
93	Only for the defined commercial core areas. Otherwise, for example, Douglas Blvd. could look (as it sometimes already does) like a flea market.						
105	Sign restrictions are fine as they are.						
135	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
136	Sign restrictions as currently stated keep commercial businesses from putting up tall, intrusive signs where inappropriate. Sign regulations are good the way they are.						
138	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
157	Not updated to include over-lighted signs- too large signs- temporary signs.						

<b>172</b>	Need to see first.						
<b>173</b>	You mean to allow neon, video signs, billboards and monuments? No thanks. Low (eye-level) discreet signage only. Anything else is hazardous, an eyesore and cheapens the community.						
<b>175</b>	The current restrictions are appropriate.						
<b>180</b>	No more A-frame type signs for businesses. Commercial properties should only be allowed to have for lease signs in the window- no large signage out in the landscaped areas.						
<b>184</b>	Do not need to be reviewed or updated. No change to existing community plan.						
<b>229</b>	Existing regulations seem to be satisfactory. Would not want to see monument signs.						
<b>236</b>	Again, what does this mean? Relax the existing County sign ordinance further?						
<b>240</b>	Should be more restrictive.						
<b>241</b>	The original sign regulations are fine.						
<b>243</b>	No commercial large signs. No neon.						
<b>244</b>	Yes, if by local residents.						
<b>MONUMENT SIGNS FOR SHOPPING CENTERS SHOULD IDENTIFY TENANTS, AS WELL AS, THE NAME OF THE SHOPPING CENTER.</b>		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		<b>9%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
<b>4</b>	Yes.						
<b>10</b>	And add street numbers.						
<b>26</b>	Not needed.						
<b>30</b>	No new developments.						
<b>36</b>	I don't see why this is an issue. Granite Bay is a small rural community. We should know what businesses are here without needing to display on another sign other than what's already on the storefront. It just clutters up the signage. Keep it simple.						
<b>48</b>	Let center decide. Private property.						
<b>51</b>	Should be setback away from road. Quarry Pond sign is too close to Douglas and blocks view of traffic when you leave center.						
<b>54</b>	Too much.						
<b>55</b>	Helpful information for would be shoppers, but adds to much print for drivers- should be placed away from entrances- set back.						
<b>69</b>	We don't want Granite Bay looking like Las Vegas.						
<b>75</b>	Granite Bay residents can find tenants, we are not that big of a community. Do not want large signs. Maintain rural quality.						
<b>77</b>	Has to meet code in size- how many tenants?						

- 89** Keep current code that restricts the size and height; it also restricts tenants names listed on signs which is in place for aesthetics and consistency throughout community.
- 93** Provided this is limited to core areas and size and number of monument signs is also limited.
- 105** We do not want big signs. Again, we do not want to become another Roseville.
- 122** Keep signs small.
- 135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 136** Too many words on signs if very distracting for traffic. Also take away from "rural" feel.
- 138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 157** But not too large.
- 165** I have not seen these so cannot comment.
- 166** Depends on size of sign and number of tenants. This is better handled within more specific guidelines with "if/then" parameters.
- 170** Add street address also to signs.
- 172** Why make this a requirement?
- 173** No. Local shoppers know who the tenants are.
- 174** Too many signs as is.
- 175** We don't need the large, busy signage that Roseville has already. People easily know what tenants are in the few centers we have.
- 176** Listing every tenant makes for too much signage.
- 180** Only if the developer wants it and it meets signage size guidelines.
- 184** As long as it meets sign regulations for Granite Bay.
- 234** Anchor or major tenants need appropriate large signs. Monument signs for small tenants/shops are not of great value.
- 236** No. let's retain some dignity. Douglas should not become another Madison Avenue.
- 240** Provide that sign is small scale, not neon or brightly lit.
- 242** No. Against plan.

THE PLAN SHOULD IDENTIFY AND PRESERVE HISTORIC STRUCTURES WITHIN THE GRANITE BAY AREA.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		28%	36%	24%	9%	3%	0%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
2	Fire hazards.						
4	Yes.						
8	Within reason.						
12	Agree providing it does not cost taxpayers. Let the historic structure owner pay for the preservation.						
33	Can you first identify this and make the information to the public first, before you ask for a decision?						
41	Placer County has historic structures that are not visited and are expensive to maintain. Why add Granite Bay's lesser historic buildings and sites to the "off limit" category? Old is good but not sacred.						
43	Which ones?						
47	Not sure there are more than a handful that qualify as historic. How is historic defined?						
48	Historic definition?						
59	On a case-by-case basis.						
70	This item should either be given attention or dropped from the community plan.						
77	Don't know of any- private funding to preserve.						
86	What historic structures?						
90	Include historic trees or any trees over 200 years of extended age in this category.						
93	I don't suppose there are very many- fewer than ten?						
98	Where are they?						
101	Use common sense, i.e. old barns and cottonwood trees.						
124	It depends. It can encourage but not mandate this.						
135	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
138	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
164	Are there any?						
166	If preserved, how funded and by whom? Who decided which structures are "historic?" Perhaps there should be a clear process to help support this.						
170	Yes, they need to be identified and preserved.						
173	Not sure where these are but generally agree. Folsom Historic Museum has a large historic collection for this entire lake area.						
174	What historic structures?						

180		Can't really think of many.					
181		Are there any really historic structures in Granite Bay?					
LIMIT SENIOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS TO SINGLE-STORY.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		32%	37%	17%	8%	4%	0%
Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)							
4	Yes. No new building.						
8	Not necessarily. It's nice, but senior population may grow and housing may be at a premium. Single-story limits how many people can be housed. Land is limited.						
9	This is common sense and should be left to the market to decide (seller/buyer).						
30	No new developments.						
35	But not until services are available to support.						
36	Don't senior typically want single-story anyway. Maybe mostly single-story.						
46	Again, no high density. However, structures like "Eskaton" should be allowed if meet zone requirement.						
48	Let developer decide what needs are, not County. Single-story would require twice the land and seniors would have a hard time walking the distance in building.						
55	Nice for seniors- no steps.						
60	Not necessary.						
64	The market and demand dictate what is going to be built.						
68	Low density.						
70	This might make practical sense but should the plan regulate?						
77	High-density housing- especially near facilities- should include a large number of single-story homes.						
82	The current Eskaton facility is hideous. Who approved that design.						
83	Should be encouraged not mandated.						
85	Should be encouraged not mandated.						
86	Don't need rule, it is obvious.						
89	This should not be a requirement of the plan. I don't understand why this comment is included for all to agree/disagree, yet the comment regarding changes to the plan is not included in this questionnaire.						
90	I can't think of an appropriate location for additional senior housing. Perhaps in the Douglas/Sierra College intersection area.						

**93** Why? If located near commercial core, could be an acceptable buffer.  
**105** And limit to low-density.  
**123** Work within existing plan.  
**124** Work within existing plan.  
**126** Not needed- no more facilities.  
**129** No senior housing at all.  
**130** No senior housing.  
**131** No senior housing. Do not want senior housing in Granite Bay.  
**132** This statement contains an assumption that Granite Bay wants and needs a senior housing development.  
**133** No senior housing.  
**136** And low-density.  
**157** Should also have space to breath, adequate parking, etc. That mess on the southeast corner of Douglas and Auburn Folsom will be a parking nightmare.  
**158** No new senior housing.  
**164** Most seniors will want single stories but for visiting kids and/or grandkids, they may want an upstairs. The developer is best person to decide what the market wants.  
**166** Two-story is fine in most cases where there is a multi-family residential development.  
**170** Need flexibility not categorical; same re: multi-family.  
**173** Multi-level = unsafe and undesirable for seniors. Single-story only throughout the community.  
**175** This will both control density and benefit the residents who may have difficulty climbing stairs.  
**177** I would propose no more than three-story.  
**180** One-story should be encouraged, not mandated.  
**184** Only for areas that are zoned for senior housing. No change to existing community plan.  
**232** Why?  
**233** No senior housing. Single-stories are available.  
**234** No. They can walk stairs, but need elevators.  
**238** No new structures for specific groups.  
**240** Limit is two-story or a set height limit.  
**241** If you are going to allow "senior developments" it makes sense to build two-story structures for more efficient land use. With adequate design regulations they would have a decent appearance.

NEW GATED COMMUNITIES SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		19%	10%	32%	13%	25%	0%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
2	Because of security and safety.						
4	No.						
8	What's the problem? Gated communities have to pay for streets, etc. HOA maintains property and appearance.						
10	Gated communities do not provide "travel through" and forces children on to main streets.						
48	Let market decide need, not County.						
49	We have enough now.						
59	Leave it up to the fire district.						
60	What's wrong with them?						
62	As long as the lots are large.						
68	Low density.						
70	Gated communities restrict connectivity.						
77	Divide community- prohibits safe walking areas.						
86	Why not? They are nice, safe, more expensive homes.						
89	No gated development. All currently gated neighborhoods should have their gates opened 6AM - 6PM and their pedestrian gates always unlocked so kids can bike/walk through the neighborhoods.						
90	High-density is the problem, not the gate.						
93	Gates isolate neighborhoods from community.						
115	That's keeping Granite Bay rural; no more growth needed.						
122	Gate private roads.						
126	Only if conform to 2.6 acres per house.						
157	Why not?						
164	Many people, including the elderly, want a gated community. I see no harm in that.						
166	Add specificity on what is discouraged against what could be considered.						
170	And interior should include publicly accessible trails especially connectors for network of trails.						
173	New "subdivisions" using a gate as marketing tool should not be allowed. However, private streets (existing) off busy thoroughfares should have the option to have a night gate for security. There are only two patrol cars for all of Granite Bay. We had a breaking on our street in 2008 and it took 20 minutes for the Sheriff to arrive.						

<b>174</b>	If an existing residential development wants a gate, it should be allowed.						
<b>180</b>	Up to the developer.						
<b>234</b>	Perceived value- minimal security without guards.						
<b>238</b>	Gated communities should not be permitted.						
<b>240</b>	Gated communities do not promote a sense of community. By definition gates are exclusive.						
<b>TWO-STORY COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS SHOULD BE LIMITED TO EXISTING COMMERCIAL AREAS AT AUBURN-FOLSOM ROAD/DOUGLAS BLVD. AND SIERRA COLLEGE BLVD./DOUGLAS BLVD.</b>		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		<b>38%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
<b>1</b>	No two-story buildings.						
<b>4</b>	Yes.						
<b>10</b>	Allow for new if property planned.						
<b>11</b>	This equates to? Size like Raleys? If so, no bigger than Raleys.						
<b>21</b>	No two-story buildings.						
<b>25</b>	We don't want any two-story commercial buildings.						
<b>34</b>	Seems like one-story is the prevailing norm.						
<b>36</b>	We don't need more commercial buildings.						
<b>46</b>	As long as no zone change.						
<b>51</b>	They should be one-story.						
<b>59</b>	Too inflexible- let MAC review.						
<b>66</b>	Do not need two-story commercial buildings.						
<b>69</b>	There is no more space left to build out in these areas.						
<b>77</b>	OK- but no two-story on Douglas Boulevard.						
<b>82</b>	No commercial buildings on Douglas and Auburn Folsom.						
<b>89</b>	No additional commercial along Douglas Blvd. and Auburn Folsom. Areas currently zoned for commercial is enough.						
<b>90</b>	Change use could allow senior center in these spots.						
<b>93</b>	Define the core areas.						
<b>105</b>	And there's no need for them to be added either.						
<b>116</b>	Two-story commercial building not in keeping with rural atmosphere.						
<b>126</b>	No more.						



- 129** No two-story buildings anywhere.
- 130** No two-story commercial buildings.
- 131** There shouldn't be an two-story commercial buildings in Granite Bay.
- 132** No two-story structures anywhere in Granite Bay.
- 135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 136** There is no need for two-story commercial buildings. Makes it look too urban.
- 138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 141** Don't know other proposed areas.
- 146** Do we need more commercial buildings?
- 157** No two-story.
- 158** Should not be allowed anywhere.
- 164** Not necessarily, but probably.
- 166** Along Auburn Folsom and Douglas and Sierra corridors, not just those intersections.
- 170** Need flexibility.
- 172** Should not be allowed at all.
- 173** Prohibited. No large multi-level structures- who is going in them? Small shops fit the small size of the community and blend with the landscape/environment. I am not aware of any two-story commercial buildings except Eskaton and some apartments on Leona.
- 174** Should be single-story only.
- 180** Case-by-case. If going two-story, lessen the footprint on the property thereby providing more open space that is landscaped maybe. Two-story just to have a larger building, no.
- 184** No change to existing community plan.
- 243** No commercial two-story buildings along Douglas, especially Quarry Ponds.

COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS IN GRANITE BAY SHOULD HAVE A SIZE CAP OF 25,000 SQUARE FEET.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		23%	22%	21%	7%	24%	1%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
4	Yes.						
21	No more commercial buildings.						
30	No new developments.						
33	I don't know how this compares to current regulations.						
34	Depends on configuration, but that seems too large.						
36	I don't even like the idea of more commercial.						
41	Let the square footage be set by what the Granite Bay "market" will bear.						
47	35,000						
48	What does one look like?						
55	Smaller square foot cap more desirable.						
59	Too inflexible- let MAC review.						
64	Need to leave it to case by case.						
68	No new commercial buildings.						
75	We do not need any more commercial buildings. Too many current vacancies.						
82	No new building of commercial properties.						
89	Don't know if 25K sq.ft. max is appropriate for every project- this may be too large depending on site. No additional commercial along Douglas Blvd. and Auburn Folsom. Areas currently zoned for commercial is enough.						
90	Keep big buildings in Roseville or elsewhere.						
93	Agree we should have no single-tenant "big boxes," but some commercial buildings have classic design with multiple storefronts.						
105	They should be smaller than 25,000 sq.ft.						
107	Or smaller.						
116	No new commercial buildings.						
123	Current plan should be followed.						
124	Existing plan should be followed.						
126	No more.						
135	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
136	Or less. No new buildings are needed in Granite Bay.						

- 138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 143** Don't need big box stores.
- 157** No more commercial.
- 158** No new commercial, can't fill what we have.
- 163** I agree with the size mentioned in the Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 164** I don't know. What is the purpose of 25,000 sq.ft.? Are we trying to limit big box stores? What about huge churches like Bayside? I would rather have a nice big box store at Douglas and Auburn Folsom than the rundown shopping center where Ace is.
- 166** Unreasonable and unnecessary limitation. Should be evaluated based on relevant transportation, parking, etc considerations and more specific type of use (shopping center vs church vs professional services, etc.).
- 170** Need flexibility "fair share."
- 171** Check the Granite Bay plan and abide by this.
- 172** Not sure of detail on this one? Contiguous?
- 173** That is a very large building. We already have a vacant grocery store here. Who is going into these big boxes? We don't need large buildings in this community.
- 174** We do not need more commercial property in Granite Bay.
- 175** Size cap should be determined by lot size and surroundings.
- 177** No new needed.
- 180** Depends- case-by-case.
- 184** And single-story. No change to existing community plan.
- 232** With so many empty buildings, I do not think we presently need anymore.
- 234** Have not thought about it.
- 240** Unclear if this means per building, per parcel or per project.
- 243** No development.

CURRENT LANDSCAPE GUIDELINES FOR GRANITE BAY SHOULD BE UPDATED.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		12%	19%	35%	21%	13%	0%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
2	No oak trees.						
4	Landscape is already nice.						
9	They should be reviewed and updated if necessary and appropriate.						
11	It is horrible right now.						
12	Current guidelines are adequate.						
30	Seem OK.						
34	Reviewed by expert landscaper, update if needed. Has looked pretty good- drought-tolerant, etc., in divider strips, etc.						
36	?						
37	No oak trees.						
48	But for what locations?						
51	Plants to be used need to require less water and less pruning. Use only natural plants indigenous to this area.						
54	I think they are sufficient, but I'd like to know if they are followed.						
59	Let MAC review.						
60	What are they?						
68	What are the current landscape guidelines?						
70	Include plants that are native to a Mediterranean climate. This would allow "non-native" species to be used that can survive our climate with minimal summer water.						
75	Cement-only barriers in roadways, Sierra College as an example, should be landscaped. Residents should be able to landscape as they would like.						
78	Not necessary.						
86	Take out lawn, go to drought resistant.						
89	Support the use of native, indigenous plants that are drought tolerant.						
93	What is in place works well.						
105	What are the current guidelines? I think you need to leave the plan alone, as is. And tell the developers to go develop Roseville or Rocklin.						
107	Why?						
109	And improved.						

**110** I don't think it is necessary to landscape our rural roads.  
**123** Current plan is fine.  
**124** To what? Disagree as we can't locate more detail.  
**130** Keep current guidelines.  
**131** Keep current plan as is.  
**132** Maintain current plan.  
**133** Keep current plan intact.  
**135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.  
**136** Don't know what they currently are.  
**138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.  
**141** Don't know content of existing guidelines.  
**157** What about green concrete and hogwire?  
**164** They should include drought-tolerant plantings but necessarily be California native. Don't limit yourselves unnecessarily.  
**165** Review first and update as needed.  
**172** Need to read and understand why someone would recommend.  
**173** What is wrong with them?  
**174** We don't need guidelines for our homes or business- it's up to the owner.  
**175** They are fine as is.  
**180** Not sure what they are but can't hurt to review.  
**184** Does not require updating.  
**229** Current guidelines have resulted in attractive, natural medians.  
**234** Try drought-resistant coverage and plans. New irrigation equipment is available.  
**240** Promote more native plants and low water use.  
**244** What are the current guidelines?  
**245** Depends on updating- I think they're fine.

RESIDENTIAL LOT SIZES SHOULD VARY IN SIZE TO PRESERVE THE RURAL CHARACTER OF GRANITE BAY.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		26%	55%	8%	3%	7%	0%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
1	Vague, ambiguous, uncertain.						
2	No more than two acres but one acre preferred.						
4	No new.						
12	Agree, providing they conform to the current plan.						
17	Maintain existing zoning. Once a rural lot is downsized, it is gone forever.						
24	Lot sizes should not be decreased by "spot zoning."						
30	Keep as is.						
36	I guess I'd want this dealt with on a case-by-case basis- I don't want to go overboard sticking to this rule if it looks/feels good overall.						
37	No more than two acres.						
43	How. 4/acre- no. 1 acre maybe.						
46	Without zone changes.						
50	Rural character can best be preserved by keeping lot sizes large and not allowing down-zonings. Large size is more important than variety of size.						
51	Keep large lots. The rural character of the area is what people moved here for.						
53	There should be a lower limit in size, i.e. nothing less than 3/4 acre.						
55	Change 'should' to 'could.'						
59	Let the current plan dictate. Changes should be reviewed.						
62	As long as they're at least 1/2 acre.						
66	Nothing smaller than 2.3 acres.						
73	Not sure what is meant here. Granite Bay currently has varying lot sizes.						
89	Do not increase density. Do not change existing zoning that will allow increased density. Development should be consistent with surrounding, especially adjacent properties.						
93	Current mix works well.						
105	No need to change current zoning.						
106	Zoning should not reduce lot sizes. No change in existing lot sizes.						
107	Just like they are now.						
111	4.6 acre zone is rural. Less than 2.3 acre is not rural. Residential lot sizes should be consistent with the current zoning.						

- 114** As currently zoned.
- 123** Current plan is fine.
- 124** Follow existing plan.
- 126** Maintain 2.5 size lots.
- 130** Current plan addresses this issue. Keep current Granite Bay plan as it is.
- 135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 136** No need to change current zoning.
- 138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 139** Residential lot sizes should be consistent with current zoning.
- 143** Keep the present zoning policy for rural estates and current residential lot sizes as they are. The above is a trick proposal.
- 154** Stay with current zoning.
- 155** As they do now. No change.
- 166** Should be primarily based on other planning considerations discussed within.
- 173** Keep residential ag at a 2.3 acre minimum (or 4.6 if zones there) and this will take care of itself.
- 174** 2.0 acre +
- 175** All lots over 2.3 acres should be preserved.
- 180** Prefer no smaller than .9 acre lots.
- 184** No change to existing community plan. It depends on the minimum size for a lot. Must specify lot sizes.
- 229** Keep as is.
- 230** Keep existing lot size criteria.
- 234** Condos? Upscale cluster homes?
- 236** Minimum .4 acre near commercial.
- 240** Statement is not clear. Does this mean different sizes side-by-side or different sizes by neighborhood? We support same sizes in a neighborhood and transitions from size to size.
- 242** Needs a minimum. Misleading questions.

NATURAL RESOURCES						
EXPAND EXISTING POLICIES TO PROTECT OPEN SPACE AND WILDLIFE HABITAT.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	40%	21%	7%	13%	19%	0%
Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)						
4	No.					
11	Oak trees should be included. The ordinance allows 50% in a lot is bad policy, has no enforcement and monitoring. An owner can cut down 50% and move on and again another 50% five years later.					
45	"Existing Policies Should Protect Open Space and Wildlife Habitat." Not as basis to reopen plan.					
47	Do not expand existing policies.					
54	Yes. Del Oro development plans to cut down the native oak wood and this changes the whole environment of 116 acres.					
59	Review against existing plan.					
64	Within reason.					
75	Stricter penalties needed for destroying habitats.					
77	Just enforce what we have. Habitat shouldn't be mitigated out of our community.					
78	No expansion necessary. GB must comply with County, State and Federal policies.					
83	Enlarge existing policies. Do not mitigate wetlands out of Granite Bay.					
90	Keep Granite Bay beautiful and natural.					
93	Current policies work well.					
106	Protect open space and wildlife.					
111	Protect existing wildlife habitat by limiting rezoning in wildlife corridor (Itchy Acres)					
122	Limited but tend to agree.					
166	At what cost and by whom? "Expansion" many not be necessary. Perhaps should be "maintain" instead. Would be helpful to get more info. on scope of proposed expansion.					
173	No development around Folsom Lake.					
176	Again, I believe we can maintain habitats and keep overgrowth and dead wood at a minimum.					
180	Don't mitigate wetlands.					
229	Current General Plan is adequate.					
245	That "encourage" protection...					



EXPAND EXISTING POLICIES TO PROTECT WATERSHEDS.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		36%	25%	28%	5%	6%	0%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
4	No.						
10	Reduce over-grazing to reduce runoff.						
51	Don't build in wetlands, you mess up the entire drainage pattern.						
59	Review against plan.						
64	But let logic and common sense dictate.						
77	Enforce ordinances in effect.						
78	Not necessary. Enforce tree cutting codes and other ordinances.						
83	Enforce current regulations.						
90	Maintain healthy creeks.						
93	Current policies (and Federal Corps of Engineers 404 Permits, State Water Resources, Fish & Game, etc) work well.						
111	Itchy Acres area.						
122	Limited, but tend to agree.						
164	Only if existing policies aren't sufficient.						
166	Similar response as above- why "expand?" Why not "maintain?"						
173	Creeks run throughout Granite Bay. There is a preserved marsh next to the art center on Douglas- no commercial development or medium-density should go near it.						
174	There are enough regulations on the book at this time- we need more water storage.						
245	Not clear on this- there are already many protections.						

UPDATE FLOOD CONTROL POLICIES AS THEY RELATE TO NEW RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		33%	25%	28%	5%	7%	1%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
4	Yes.						
19	This seems to assume more is coming. If so, I must agree but I am against more development on a larger scale.						
30	No new developments.						
35	More pavement means more runoff.						
48	Job for FEMA.						
51	Residential, commercial building does not need to be near wetlands.						
59	Review against plan.						
60	What does this mean?						
70	100 year and 500 year floodplain maps should be added to the plan to denote affected parcels.						
77	Part of planning process.						
78	Keep new development out of floodplains.						
83	Enforce current regulations.						
90	What does this mean? Bulldoze and fill? If so, then absolutely not.						
93	Placer Water Conservation and Flood Control appears to be doing an adequate job.						
106	If this changes existing zoning, we do not agree.						
111	Also existing areas such as Itchy Acres.						
115	More development results in more residents. No more needed.						
123	Should not be in community plan.						
124	Beyond scope of current plan? County issue?						
135	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
138	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
164	Flood control policies should be updated wherever appropriate and not just for new developments.						
172	If there are threats, yes, but otherwise....why?						
174	There's enough regulations at this time.						
178	No new development.						
229	Not if it opens the door for further development.						
238	It is already County policy on new construction.						



PROVIDE FOR SPECIFIC MEASURES TO CONTROL STORM-WATER RUNOFF (I.E. LIMIT IMPERVIOUS SURFACES; ENCOURAGE RETENTION BASINS, LOW-IMPACT DEVELOPMENT FEATURES, ETC.).		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		30%	32%	14%	19%	3%	1%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
4	No.						
51	Impervious surfaces need to be discourages, low-impact development encouraged and water should be allowed to follow natural pathways.						
59	Review against plan.						
64	However, balance is good. Need to have logic still control.						
70	Percent of paved surface allowed per parcel before mitigating measures would take effect.						
77	Part of planning approval process.						
89	Do not increase density- this will help ensure lowered amount of impervious surface added as GB adds new development.						
90	This the better way to mitigate flooding problems.						
93	Again, PWCFC District, together with FEMA and water quality regulators- these agencies do an adequate job.						
111	Itchy Acres area.						
124	Already in plans.						
135	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
138	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
141	If required.						
172	Why? Don't want more rules just because it seems right.						
174	We have that in place.						
245	I believe these are already in place.						

STREAM CORRIDORS SHOULD BE PLACED IN OPEN SPACE AREAS, NOT WITHIN PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL LOTS.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		24	25%	%	17%	5%	3%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
3	For new lots.						
4	Yes.						
11	This will also allow greater opportunities for more trails and trail connectivity.						
24	Stream corridors should not be built in but should be preserved as open space.						
34	This has a lot of ramifications- individual basis.						
36	Where it makes sense.						
41	Leave as nature and past private residential lots have developed to date.						
46	No stream diversion.						
51	Stream corridors should be left natural and should not be moved around or closed in by development.						
55	No opinion/reference point.						
59	Review against plan.						
64	Yes for new developments.						
66	They should be left alone.						
70	By mutual understanding and with funding mechanisms for maintenance.						
75	Easier for County to maintain (spray mosquitoes) and manage flood control. Should only apply to new development.						
78	Placed? Streams go where they go, but should be protected some way.						
83	Remain in open space.						
85	Remain in open space.						
89	All stream corridors and all other natural resources be placed in open space areas designates as public land. If this is not incorporated and enforced for any new developments the community will not be able to ensure their natural resources are protected. This is a must.						
90	I am not sure what the implications of this are. Sometimes private residential lots are large enough to allow for healthy streams and other times not. Perhaps a 25' nature belt should extend on each side of a stream.						
93	Stream corridors already exist; they should not be "placed." Riparian setbacks are already required.						
109	That's not always possible.						
111	Itchy Acres area.						
124	Too specific. One size does not fit all.						

126	Leave private land private.						
135	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
138	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
146	How do you change stream corridors?						
155	Wherever the streams are.						
164	If practical, then yes.						
165	I'm not quite sure what this is trying to address. We should maintain open space around stream corridors though.						
166	Unless already naturally part of lot (lots of naturally occurring springs here).						
170	Should be places where environmentally appropriate.						
172	Nature defines stream corridors, don't build on them if they are there.						
174	Place where it makes sense.						
175	This is not necessary if large lots are preserved.						
229	On larger lots, it is only feasible solution.						
<b>PROVIDE FOR ADDITIONAL OPEN SPACE AREAS IN GRANITE BAY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PRESERVING WILDLIFE HABITAT.</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
		<b>35%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
4	Yes.						
21	I like it the way it is.						
43	Need- so mitigation local.						
47	No additional.						
51	Since moving to Granite Bay in 1969, there has been a loss of wildlife- most notably the Meadowlark, Killdeer, quail, frogs, toads.						
59	Review against plan.						
70	By mutual understanding and with funding mechanisms for maintenance.						
77	Part of planning approval process.						
78	Already provided for. Additional not necessary.						
90	Keep Granite Bay natural.						
93	This probably needs additional study. Where I live, invasive (and thorny) berry bushes have become an important wildlife habitat next to streams.						
109	How?						

<b>111</b>	Itchy Acres area.						
<b>122</b>	We are too urban for much of this.						
<b>166</b>	Like previous comments, why "additional?" Is existing space appropriate? If expanded, at what cost and by whom?						
<b>173</b>	Observe current plan zoning and this takes care of itself.						
<b>174</b>	Leave as is. Take a break. Stop spending money; cut cost.						
<b>180</b>	Depends on the cost to the taxpayer- no higher taxes.						
<b>229</b>	Keep as is.						
<b>240</b>	Encourage linking of open space areas so there are continuous corridors for wildlife movement.						
<b>245</b>	Encourage- I'm not sure who the County can "require" this.						
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>							
<b>POLICIES REGARDING OPEN BURNING SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE COMMUNITY PLAN.</b>		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		<b>19%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
<b>4</b>	No.						
<b>11</b>	For those of us with bad allergies, burn days on certain "allowable" days is a nightmare.						
<b>24</b>	The current burning policy is working and doesn't need to be changed.						
<b>30</b>	Seem OK.						
<b>33</b>	With residential density increasing, and known health implications of smoke, this should be included.						
<b>35</b>	Open burning is necessary when larger lots are used to rid of accumulation of native material in accordance with burn days.						
<b>36</b>	We're already restricted. I don't want to go overboard. I like having the freedom to burn on my large lot. I can't fit all of my clean-up in one green bin.						
<b>41</b>	These policies belong elsewhere in the codes and not in the Granite Bay Community Plan.						
<b>51</b>	Burning needs to be allowed on more days of the month when safe burning days allow.						
<b>53</b>	As long as they don't override the Air Pollution Control for residential burning.						
<b>54</b>	This should still be an option for our rural community- open burning is important when you are maintaining many acres.						
<b>55</b>	I find burning offensive and unhealthy. There are other ways to deal with broken limbs and leaves.						
<b>70</b>	With a caveat that any requirements are regulated also by air quality and fire officials.						
<b>74</b>	County regulations are sufficient.						
<b>75</b>	Fire district regulations and current system is working.						

- 77 Not appropriate to be in plan.
- 78 Fire district decides- shouldn't be in plan.
- 83 Should not be included in plan, it needs to be flexible.
- 85 Should not be included in plan, it needs to be flexible.
- 86 Only if we decide to outlaw open burning.
- 89 Isn't this a countywide code/rule? How could this be enforced as a "goal"/element of a community plan? I don't understand why this comment was included in the questionnaire when the most controversial comment, do not make any changes that will increase density of change the plan to loosen development restraints, included in for community comment (agree/disagree).
- 90 I am not aware of what the burning policies are in Granite Bay. I know we can't light fireworks so they are probably pretty restrictive.
- 93 This is the responsibility of Placer's Air Pollution Control District and South Placer Fire District.
- 103 Open burning should be severely limited, if not completely banned in Granite Bay.
- 106 No burning should be allowed.
- 107 As a policy matter- chipping could provide great alternative year-round.
- 109 A discretionary policy.
- 111 Open burning should be expanded. County should control.
- 118 Air quality control issue.
- 122 Charge fee. Subsidize chippers.
- 123 Why would this be in the community plan? No.
- 135 No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 138 No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 139 Controlled by County and Fire District and expanded. Chipping should also be provided. Provided by the County and not rely on Air Pollution Control District.
- 141 I thought that such a plan was already in existence.
- 143 Not in community plan. Should be given increased dates and times. This should be County-regulated- pollution control.
- 154 Open burning should be expanded. It should be County policy and Air Quality-controlled. Burning should be allowed on some Saturdays.
- 157 Further restrictions would be a hardship on existing ag properties.
- 164 No. This would lock us into something for years. Changes should be made when appropriate. I oppose burning but the current solution is a compromise. In the future when more health issues are known, we may want to further restrict burning.
- 172 Too many people working to regulate this. You run the risk of conflict with public agency.
- 173 Fire department issue.
- 174 What we have stinks. We live in a fire-prone area and should be able to burn on any burn day. Stop the 1-5 burn, 16-31 no-burn.
- 175 This has nothing to do with land use.
- 181 But the policy needs to be sensible. Solution other than burning need consideration.



- |            |   |
|------------|---|
| <b>229</b> | Keep as is.   |
| <b>232</b> | We need to continue the free chipping program.                                      |
| <b>240</b> | Existing burn regulations are too restrictive for those that live on large parcels. |

PUBLIC FACILITIES						
PLAN FOR RE-USE OR REDEVELOPMENT OF THE EUREKA SCHOOL.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	24%	29%	29%	12%	3%	3%
Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)						
1	Vague, ambiguous, uncertain.					
4	Yes.					
26	Don't know issue.					
35	This is up to school district as long as it is not commercial or small lot development.					
36	Use what resources we have available instead of building now. If it doesn't make sense to keep it as a school, what else can we use it for. Don't let it sit there vacant.					
48	Community center.					
51	Reuse of Eureka School needs to fit the neighborhood. No commercial development or sale for more residential building.					
58	Why?					
70	Is this a community plan item? If yes, then agree. If no, neutral.					
75	Sell Eureka School. Keep the density at the surrounding 2.3 acre minimum. Protect the cottage industry and rural feel along Eureka Road.					
77	Believe schools are special districts and not part of plan.					
78	School district business.					
90	Schools not in use could provide something more beneficial to the community.					
93	Eureka School District responsibility.					
115	Rent out for adult classes at night, OSHA (Sierra College) classes.					
123	Not applicable to community plan.					
124	Doesn't belong in community plan? Too specific.					
135	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.					
138	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.					
141	Don't understand.					
143	As a community resource.					
146	Reuse, not redevelopment.					
157	Community center?					

<b>173</b>	Unfortunate they moved the school closest to the heart of Granite Bay over to Treelike creating a traffic/safety nightmare over there. Do not add to the bad decision by repurposing the school for anything incompatible with the 2.3 acre rural ag neighborhood that surrounds it.						
<b>174</b>	2.3 acre plus lots. Sell to a developer, make money to help taxpayers.						
<b>180</b>	OK for temporary reuse. Should be retained by the school district for possible future need if demographics change and there is a large increase in children in the area.						
<b>229</b>	Should not be allowed to be developed in violation of general plan.						
<b>235</b>	Consider possible site for senior independent living or community center.						
<b>242</b>	Who owns it? Who decides?						
<b>TRAILS SHOULD CONNECT TO SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES AND BE IDENTIFIED ON THE COMMUNITY PLAN TRAILS EXHIBIT.</b>		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		<b>24%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
<b>1</b>	Follow existing Community Plan.						
<b>4</b>	Yes.						
<b>10</b>	Add bike trails and bike lanes. Roads repaved should include bike lanes.						
<b>26</b>	Lack of bike paths a huge negative in Granite Bay. Bike paths are in keeping with rural character and should be privatized. Then we can safely move about without our cars.						
<b>54</b>	Not through neighborhoods.						
<b>57</b>	No trails should go through private property unless the owner voluntarily agrees to it.						
<b>59</b>	Review against plan.						
<b>77</b>	Part of trail plan already.						
<b>83</b>	At no financial impact to property owners.						
<b>85</b>	No financial impacts to property owners.						
<b>90</b>	This would be very nice.						
<b>93</b>	I think regional trails are already included in County/City of Roseville/State Parks planning.						
<b>124</b>	Trust County to work in best interests of the community.						
<b>143</b>	This should include new developments as well.						
<b>170</b>	Should provide for corridors and not specific routes. Should be opportunistic in requiring trail dedications even if not on map.						
<b>173</b>	OK to identify them but do not understand the need of fiscal rationale for extending them to other communities.						
<b>180</b>	Depends on cost- no higher taxes.						

REVIEW NATIONAL PARK STANDARDS FOR APPLICABILITY TO PARKS IN THE GRANITE BAY AREA.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		9%	25%	41%	13%	8%	4%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
1	Follow existing Community Plan.						
4	Yes.						
10	Should be normal part of business for the County.						
11	The NRPA standards are only a starting point. A greater effort needs to occur specific to the local trends, needs and desires.						
26	Don't know.						
35	And State parks.						
51	I'm not sure what this entails.						
57	They are not comparable.						
60	What does this mean?						
70	NRPA criteria is to ask the community what activities and facilities they would like to see and use in their community rather than use a boilerplate of a "standard facility list" that is used in most communities.						
75	National Parks are in trouble. We can do better. We should set the standard with connecting trails and amenities not found in other parks.						
77	Not applicable.						
90	I am unsure of what this is about.						
93	Only in the interface with our community: Trails, traffic, etc.						
106	Not sure about National Park Standards.						
122	Relevant?						
124	County standards seem fine- trust the local government.						
135	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
138	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
143	Unsure what is being asked.						
154	Don't understand the question. Need more information.						
157	Don't know enough about National Park Standards.						
172	No. While national parks are nice the cost factor is huge.						
173	We already border a state park/recreation area.						
180	?						

<b>229</b>	Why?					
<b>234</b>	What's the standards of a National Park vs. Granite Bay? No comparison.					
<b>240</b>	What are the national park standards? If it means park or no park, I'll take the park that does not meet standards.					
<b>NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS SHOULD BE REQUIRED AND LOCATED WITHIN NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS.</b>		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		<b>22%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>4%</b>
						<b>1%</b>
Comments						
<b>2</b>	More crime areas.					
<b>4</b>	No.					
<b>9</b>	I do not believe this should be mandated for all new residential developments. Perhaps this is appropriate based on some minimum development size (acres or number of units).					
<b>26</b>	Probably too much.					
<b>30</b>	No new developments.					
<b>36</b>	Depends on the size of the community and where the nearest existing park(s) are in relation to the new community.					
<b>55</b>	This would permit more walking rather than driving to parks- less street traffic and encourage also more open space in developments.					
<b>58</b>	I don't think we need any new developments. If there are new residential developments, then parks should be required.					
<b>64</b>	For four lot per acre and larger.					
<b>70</b>	I'm in favor of parks in community separated by arterials (major roads). Funding mechanism must be worked out.					
<b>75</b>	Don't repeat the Treelake mistake.					
<b>77</b>	Encouraged- not required. Probably too late in plan that is almost built out.					
<b>83</b>	Encourage but not mandated.					
<b>85</b>	Encourage but not mandated.					
<b>93</b>	Of course, but, park fees paid by developers should be acknowledged.					
<b>115</b>	No new developments needed.					
<b>124</b>	Follow existing plan and to on a case-by-case basis.					
<b>164</b>	This would be nice but it depends on how large the development is. This statement is too vague.					
<b>166</b>	Depends on size of development and proximity to other parks.					
<b>173</b>	If you agree with medium-density, then developers must create such parks. We disagree with medium-density and enjoy a State park right next door as well as numerous parks already in the community.					
<b>174</b>	300 yard buffer zone between residences and park.					
<b>180</b>	Should be encouraged not required.					

- |            |   |
|------------|---|
| <b>184</b> | No change to existing community plan.   |
| <b>234</b> | Size matters.   |
| <b>240</b> | Subject to a minimum-sized development (perhaps anything larger than 50 residential units). |
| <b>245</b> | Depends on the size of the development.   |

TRANSPORTATION						
LIMIT "PASS THROUGH" TRAFFIC IN LOCAL NEIGHBORHOODS.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	39%	29%	13%	12%	5%	0%
Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)						
4	Yes.					
10	Yes but allow access for walking, playing and kids on bikes.					
11	Also address flow issues on "pass through" routes such as Douglas (similar to how County is dealing with Auburn Folsom).					
26	Some is needed.					
34	But how? Guess traffic experts know.					
47	County Planning/Engineering should have discretion.					
54	Yes, my street has a speed limit of 35 MPH and people go 50+ all the time.					
59	This could cause a problem in an emergency.					
70	Widen Auburn-Folsom and Douglas Blvd. to accommodate larger and faster traffic.					
77	Traffic should be spread out in residential neighborhood. Thru traffic kept to Auburn Folsom and Douglas corridor.					
86	Need pass-through.					
89	No more traffic lights on Douglas. This will keep pass-through traffic moving through GB without non-residents speeding through neighborhoods to avoid the slowed traffic/perceived slowed traffic on Douglas.					
93	How is this policed? Better to design (no more traffic lights) Douglas and Auburn Folsom to include "pass through" traffic projections, paid for by South Placer Regional Transportation Agency supplemented with State and Federal funding. Keep Granite Bay traffic mitigation fees for improvement of local roads, bike lanes and walkways.					
111	Itchy Acres area.					
122	Especially through private roads.					
124	Case-by-case basis. County responsibility.					
135	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.					
136	This would be benefited by no more commercial buildings on main streets (i.e. Douglas Blvd).					
138	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.					
139	Especially local neighborhoods with private roads like Itchy Acres Road.					
143	How would this be done?					
146	How do you control this?					
154	How?					

<b>157</b>	?						
<b>164</b>	I agree, if this possible.						
<b>165</b>	Especially in school zones.						
<b>166</b>	Unsure what "pass through" means. Neighborhood traffic planning should be part of overall development and transportation planning.						
<b>170</b>	"Pass through" as to cars only. Trails, public transit, bikeways, etc. should be preferred in local neighborhoods and should connect with regional and communitywide systems.						
<b>173</b>	Yes. We live off Douglas and traffic has noticeably increases since the opening of Folsom Lake crossing. We do not want traffic diverted into our street.						
<b>174</b>	Do not put additional traffic in existing residential areas.						
<b>184</b>	No change to existing community plan.						
<b>230</b>	The "Barton Freeway" between E. Roseville Pkwy. And Placer/Sacramento County line should be shut down by blocking ingress/egress at county line. Traffic volumes are excessive.						
<b>236</b>	Clogging up Douglas with commercial will cause this. Also, allowing pass-through for nearby residential traffic is an appropriate goal and is in the existing plan. Why get on Douglas or Auburn Folsom to go a few blocks?						
<b>240</b>	This statement is too vague. I am also in favor of motherhood and like apple pie. I oppose barricades as used in midtown Sacramento and Berkeley.						
<b>PROVIDE AN ALTERNATIVE EAST-WEST CORRIDOR THROUGH GRANITE BAY (SIMILAR TO THE ONE-TIME PROPOSED ROCKLIN ROAD EXTENSION).</b>		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		<b>7%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
<b>4</b>	?						
<b>9</b>	Should be explored and reviewed by the community.						
<b>10</b>	Yes, but plan it well. It doesn't have to be commercial.						
<b>11</b>	Not real familiar with Rocklin Road proposal but any alternative east-west route would help.						
<b>12</b>	This would be nice but it is probably too late as property that could be used for these right-of-ways is no longer available.						
<b>24</b>	Additional traffic should be actively discouraged not given an extra pass-through route.						
<b>26</b>	Probably good, but I don't know argument.						
<b>34</b>	Need one to south, not north.						



- 35** We need another east-west route but not north of Douglas but south to reduce congestion on Douglas and create a new corridor to Folsom.
- 36** I'd like to see alternative plans first. Any alternative plans will affect rural areas which defeats our plan.
- 42** Where?
- 48** Not needed back when and not now.
- 51** Douglas Blvd. is like a super freeway with cars going 65 MPH.
- 55** This would be great if it is in the realm of possibility.
- 70** This would improve connectivity. Possible Olive Ranch Road or Cavitt-Stallman with Sierra College?
- 77** Probably too late- along power lines.
- 78** It's too late.
- 89** Where? Eureka?
- 93** SPRTA should address this.
- 96** Eureka needs to be beautified and become more community-friendly. Example: Treelake Pkwy.
- 105** We don't want more traffic coming through.
- 106** This would bring more traffic to Granite Bay.
- 115** Auburn Folsom Road doubled traffic in last seven years.
- 123** "Examine an alternative" not "provide."
- 124** Should say "examine an alternative..."
- 135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 136** Do not want to encourage more traffic through Granite Bay.
- 138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 141** Not familiar enough to comment.
- 143** Douglas is four lane and 55 MPH, that's enough for Granite Bay.
- 157** Just like the damage punching Eureka through to the freeway. Caused great traffic problems.
- 166** Doesn't seem viable without being detrimental to overall community plan. Address via other policies regarding density allowed and transportation.
- 170** And use existing Rocklin Road easement for multiuse trail. Easement was reserved when road was stopped. There is still an easement.
- 172** Need to see the proposed. Right now it is contained. Adding more will cause more development.
- 173** You mean another Douglas? To benefit whom and for what purpose? Commuters and new merchants who will serve them? Leave Eureka Road alone.
- 174** OK as is. Just stop adding more homes and businesses. Make Auburn Folsom four lane all the way- Folsom to Granite bay.
- 175** Not necessary if we maintain the Douglas corridor as is.
- 180** Propose a "parkway" from near the new Folsom bridge to Sierra College Blvd. underneath the huge power line structures.
- 184** No change to existing community plan.

- |            |   |
|------------|---|
| <b>229</b> | Only logical route would be Eureka Road- not a good idea.             |
| <b>238</b> | Orangevale or Rocklin can have alternative corridor, not Granite Bay. |

PROVIDE FOR SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS AND HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBILITY.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		19%	29%	32%	14%	5%	0%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
2	This is a State plan, not a community plan.						
4	Yes.						
8	Sidewalks are needed especially for children and adults.						
11	Address traffic flow issues at Granite Bay High School.						
33	Agree, but this is conditional. We don't need to go overboard on this initiative either. Do what is logical and minimally necessary if any change is needed at all.						
43	How?						
48	Roads exists now. It's the way they are used.						
54	I think this is already current.						
70	Work with schools to elevate roads taken by children. Evaluate accessible barriers in public places.						
75	We need wider bike lanes, wide decomposed granite, walking paths for pedestrians. Make Granite Bay a walking and bike riding community.						
77	Improve trail system, i.e. shoulders along Barton, etc.						
78	Improve trail system. Not necessary.						
83	Improve trail system for all. No financial impact to property owners.						
85	Improve trail systems for all. No financial impact to property owners.						
93	Of course.						
124	Already policy.						
141	If needed.						
143	School districts need to provide crossing guards.						
148	How?						
157	With the traffic already packing our streets- it's a little late isn't it?						
163	We have this already.						
165	All school zones/streets should automatically qualify for the Placer County neighborhood traffic management program.						
170	Strongly encourage car pooling, especially to off-site areas with kids walking at least part way. Penalize one passenger drop-offs.						
172	Concerns me when someone says "make safe." At what cost?						
173	Stop the density and this takes care of itself.						

<b>175</b>	Not needed other than to stop The Enclave (at Twin Schools) and stop high-density proposals at Seno and Douglas.						
<b>180</b>	Already seems pretty safe and handicapped accessible.						
<b>238</b>	Is this to say there are no safe routes now? Is this for children walking and riding bikes? ADA governs regulations on handicapped accessibility, plan or no plan.						
<b>240</b>	This statement is too vague. I like motherhood and apple pie too.						
<b>INCREASE AVAILABILITY AND TYPES OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
		<b>8%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
<b>2</b>	More crime, who will use it?						
<b>4</b>	No.						
<b>9</b>	This is a semi-rural community. It is not a "destination" community that requires significant public transportation.						
<b>36</b>	Is there a need?						
<b>47</b>	It needs to be driven by demand. If low demand, don't increase.						
<b>48</b>	No. Buses in Roseville have one or two passengers.						
<b>51</b>	A good bus service would help.						
<b>55</b>	Only if the scale of the public transport was small- as those small "Dial-a-Ride" buses.						
<b>60</b>	This is a high cost waste of money.						
<b>70</b>	Demand should drive an increase or decrease in public transportation. Planning should "allow" for use of public transportation, i.e. bus turnouts etc.						
<b>75</b>	I wasn't aware that there was any public transportation. Extend light rail to connect to Granite Bay.						
<b>86</b>	Waste of money here.						
<b>93</b>	Accessibility to defined core areas should be enhanced.						
<b>110</b>	We are in the country- do we really need busses? I don't think so.						
<b>122</b>	Yea.						
<b>124</b>	Can't afford due to density.						
<b>139</b>	Not the nature of Granite Bay.						
<b>155</b>	Not Granite Bay.						
<b>157</b>	Buses can't get through the traffic jams any faster than cars.						

<p><b>161</b></p> <p><b>166</b></p> <p><b>170</b></p> <p><b>173</b></p> <p><b>174</b></p> <p><b>180</b></p> <p><b>235</b></p>	<p>Link to other transit like light rail in Folsom.</p> <p>May not be necessary or desired, based on our community's patterns and modes of transportation.</p> <p>And provide parking for regional users of trails, equestrians, picnic areas, parks, etc.</p> <p>Again, public transit = urban/suburban community need. Some of these parts reflect an agenda to transform Granite Bay into a city.</p> <p>No thanks.</p> <p>OK as is.</p> <p>No new taxes.</p> <p>Only if financially feasible.</p>						
<p><b>LIMIT ON-STREET PARKING/RESTRICT OVERNIGHT PARKING ON ROADWAYS.</b></p>		<p>Strongly Agree</p> <p><b>20%</b></p>	<p>Agree</p> <p><b>40%</b></p>	<p>Neutral</p> <p><b>15%</b></p>	<p>Disagree</p> <p><b>16%</b></p>	<p>Strongly Disagree</p> <p><b>7%</b></p>	<p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>1%</b></p>
<p><b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b></p> <p><b>4</b> No.</p> <p><b>36</b> On major roads, yes. In residential, should be part of CC&amp;Rs.</p> <p><b>48</b> Laws exist now.</p> <p><b>51</b> It is dangerous to have cars parked on streets in residential areas. There are exceptions of course when someone is having a special event for a couple of hours.</p> <p><b>54</b> This is not what a rural community is about- telling people where they can park is an example of Sun City mentality.</p> <p><b>70</b> Vehicle code should apply.</p> <p><b>89</b> Leave plan as is- no changes.</p> <p><b>93</b> Good idea for most areas, but hard to enforce.</p> <p><b>124</b> It's not broken so can't fix it.</p> <p><b>135</b> No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.</p> <p><b>138</b> No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.</p> <p><b>157</b> With higher density that is already being allowed there is little space for parking. These tacky tracts have no other space to park cars, boats, RVs.</p> <p><b>166</b> Should be allowed in residential areas, restricted in and around commercial areas.</p> <p><b>173</b> Keep lot sizes large and this is not an issue.</p> <p><b>174</b> Unsafe. Park on private land only.</p> <p><b>175</b> Not needed if we have large lots.</p>							

229	Keep as is.										
230	Keep as is.										
234	Too general of a question- good idea- may not be overall practical. In some interior neighborhoods it may be acceptable.										
236	Where necessary & appropriate.										
240	Depends on the neighborhood- may be appropriate in some areas of for commercial vehicles.										
CONSTRUCT NEW LANDSCAPE MEDIANS ALONG MAJOR TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS.						Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
						13%	22%	30%	24%	10%	1%
Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)											
1	Existing corridors only.										
4	Not necessary.										
11	Need to address service levels on maintenance of these landscape corridors.										
12	Agree providing this does not mean to replace existing medians.										
36	Depends where and cost.										
48	Only two exist. Douglas and Auburn Boulevard south.										
51	Water is limited- no more landscaped medians.										
55	Sierra College below Douglas Blvd. would really benefit from this.										
75	Concrete along Sierra College is ugly.										
77	Auburn Folsom corridor.										
78	As funds allow.										
82	They create a liability for the County.										
83	No financial impact to property owners.										
85	No financial impact to property owners.										
86	If we have money.										
89	Douglas Blvd. already has a landscaped median. The only other corridor is Auburn Folsom median turn lanes- how could landscaping this be practical? Why is this comment included for agree/disagree when the most controversial comment was not included to determine if respondents agree/disagree- The comment to not many any changes to the current plan.										
93	Already being done along Auburn Folsom widening and Douglas- these are "major transportation corridors." More stop lights would act to reduce landscape median potential.										
105	We do not want more "major transportation corridors."										
106	At present, landscape medians are not maintained property, so why create new ones?										

- 124** This is being done, right?
- 141** What corridors do you have in mind?
- 166** Only if deemed necessary.
- 170** And allow for trails and bikeways.
- 173** The main transit corridor is Douglas and it already has a median.
- 174** Cost too much. Interferes with traffic. Unsafe.
- 175** Not needed.
- 184** Not required.
- 229** Only Auburn Folsom.
- 245** Such as...? Finish Auburn Folsom. Finish landscaping Douglas please.

DESIGNATE MAJOR ROADWAYS AS SCENIC CORRIDORS.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		15%	21%	24%	14%	25%	0%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
1	?						
2	Auburn-Folsom.						
3	What does this mean? Would this increase traffic from the outside? Increased traffic is not desirable.						
4	No.						
9	Not clear on the benefits of this proposed change.						
47	So long as it does not eliminate commercial development.						
77	Already in plan.						
78	They already are.						
89	Is Douglas Blvd. and Auburn Folsom the only major roadways in GB? Why is this comment included for agree/disagree when the most controversial comment was not included to determine if respondents agree/disagree- The comment to not many any changes to the current plan.						
93	Need a cogent definition of "scenic corridor."						
106	Granite Bay is OK as is.						
141	What and where are the "scenic corridors?"						
157	What would be cost and outcome? Major upkeep mowing, pruning, landscaping.						
163	Already have this.						
166	Why? What does this mean in terms of limitations, costs, etc. vs. how they are currently categorized? Need more info. to make a good decision.						
170	With trails.						
172	Stop the commercialization and this won't be needed.						
173	They already are as long as we stick to the 300' setbacks and low-density.						
174	Waste of time and money.						
175	Setbacks and avoiding development helps keep traffic flowing well.						
240	This is an oxymoron.						
245	If it will get the County to finish the landscaping on Douglas, great.						



PROVIDE ADDITIONAL STOP LIGHTS AT KEY INTERSECTIONS ALONG DOUGLAS BOULEVARD (I.E. BERG STREET).		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		5%	19%	17%	31%	27%	0%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
4	No.						
8	Only if necessary. I don't live there so my knowledge of problem is limited.						
9	By maintaining current land use densities, this may not be necessary. However as population increases (and traffic on Douglas), this will most likely have to happen for safety reasons.						
10	Lower speed limit on Douglas. It's crazy trying to get on the road in some areas.						
12	No more traffic lights or stop signs. None.						
30	No. OK as is.						
36	This will only clog up the roads more and won't benefit enough.						
43	No.						
45	Limit to Berg on Douglas.						
46	Make sure routes that parallel Douglas are not used instead of Douglas.						
47	Support Quarry Ponds. Slow Douglas traffic. Serious safety concerns at Berg and at Quail Oaks.						
48	Change access at Bergo to right turn only.						
51	Only at Berg.						
57	Only if absolutely necessary.						
58	Yes, this would help access to Quarry Ponds center.						
59	Review traffic patterns first. The fewer traffic lights the better.						
69	More stoplights on Douglas would decrease the ability to use it as a high-speed corridor as designated in the existing community plan.						
70	If all alternatives are explored and exhausted.						
75	Help prevent the excessive speeding and noise along Douglas.						
78	There are well thought out reasons why there should not be stop signs (signals).						
82	All the increased development and commercial construction has caused this need due to unsafe conditions.						
86	Yes. Will help Quarry Ponds.						
89	Absolutely no additional traffic lights on Douglas to avoid cut-through traffic. No additional lights on Douglas was already researched and recommended by PW in the 2005 Circulation Element Update to the Plan. This was policy adopted as part of the update- to not install additional traffic lights on Douglas. No traffic light on Douglas at Berg.						
91	Also at the library.						

- 93** Would cause "pass through" traffic to use Eureka.
- 96** That would make for a friendlier community and safer.
- 105** Berg is not a major intersection. We do not want more lights. Was this question provided to you by Lisa Powers? She is the only one that things Berg is a key intersection. She needs to leave us alone.
- 115** Badly needed.
- 122** And turn lanes. Lower Douglas speed limit to 45 MPH.
- 123** County issue, not community plan issue.
- 124** County issue- not something for community plan.
- 135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 136** This would cause only more traffic along Douglas Blvd. This is not any more of a "major street" than Quail Oaks/Douglas (4-way). Quarry Ponds needs better access to their center- no stop light. More stop lights means more stop-and-go traffic. Berg is not a major intersection (only 3-way).
- 138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.
- 141** I don't know Berg Street and I am not aware of and additional intersections that should be so provided.
- 157** Thanks to too much additional development that Planning and Supervisors have allowed we do need more street lights.
- 166** Evaluate as part of more specific planning and pending development.
- 173** Berg: Right across from Quarry Ponds of course. This will impede traffic.
- 175** This will only increase traffic at backups behind the lights.
- 180** No.
- 184** Not necessary.
- 234** In time, it may be critical.
- 236** This is another effort to make Douglas into a Madison Avenue. It also clogs traffic and adds dangerous intersections which slow through-traffic, increase pollution and create a hazard for residents and visitors.
- 240** Already too many stop lights. Quarry Ponds knew the condition of Douglas traffic and chose to build there anyway. Why should we all be inconvenienced because of their stupidity?
- 242** Too many now. Will push traffic through neighborhoods.

PROVIDE FOR ADDITIONAL BIKE LANES ALONG ROADWAYS.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		24%	30%	18%	18%	8%	1%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
2	On Cavitt-Stallman only.						
4	Yes.						
8	Some roads are already too narrow. New lanes may be needed. Safety is most important.						
11	Bike lanes should be off-road. Traffic is too fast and dangerous.						
37	Especially Cavitt Stallman.						
41	Yes. Make bike trails and bike lanes connect with prior bike routes to join the bike trail system in Granite Bay.						
47	Recognize this is a biking community. Encourage more biking.						
48	Talk about preference.						
51	Bike paths/lanes need to be separated from the roadways, not just another lane of an existing road.						
57	Bike traffic is already too heavy.						
58	More bike lanes and trails would be welcomed.						
70	Type II and Type III should be tied to transportation (streets). Type I bike paths should be tied to parks, recreation and the trail system along with funding.						
75	Roseville was voted most healthiest in the nation. We can do as well. We have a beautiful area and should enjoy it. The people help keep the environment safe.						
86	Yes.						
89	This was already researched and concluded by PW in the 2005 Circulation Element Update to the Plan, and was concluded/incorporated into the update to install additional bike lanes throughout GB to connect Sierra College Blvd. area to Folsom Lake area.						
90	Barton Road.						
93	Particularly along Barton where unsafe conditions exist.						
106	We have bike lanes.						
122	Limit/control access to private road areas.						
123	County issue, not community plan.						
124	Placer County issue.						
126	Improve Auburn Folsom. Enforce speed limit or lower limit for additional safety for bike lanes.						
135	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						

<b>138</b>	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
<b>141</b>	Always when possible.						
<b>157</b>	Some roads are too dangerous for cars let alone bikes.						
<b>161</b>	Provide alternatives to the car.						
<b>165</b>	Many current bike lanes are not safe.						
<b>173</b>	Cyclists should (for their safety and to allow for safe driving) choose low-traffic routes, but I frequently see them in groups on Douglas and Auburn Folsom. Encourage bike lanes on side streets/parks (Folsom Lake has good ones).						
<b>174</b>	Bikers need to pay for bike lanes.						
<b>229</b>	Barton and Auburn Folsom.						
<b>240</b>	Along major roads but not all roads.						
<b>UTILITIES</b>							
<b>UNDERGROUND EXISTING OVERHEAD POWER LINES.</b>		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		<b>25%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
<b>3</b>	Cost to taxpayers?						
<b>4</b>	Yes.						
<b>10</b>	When money is available.						
<b>33</b>	At what cost?						
<b>36</b>	Not necessarily. If they're old and need to be placed or costly to repair, then consider.						
<b>43</b>	So wind doesn't affect power.						
<b>45</b>	Within sound economic guidelines- not when cost prohibitive.						
<b>48</b>	Only new extensions.						
<b>50</b>	Not at taxpayer expense.						
<b>51</b>	Not sure what this would entail.						
<b>54</b>	Let's not spend \$ on this now.						
<b>57</b>	Too expensive.						
<b>58</b>	If other utility undergrounding is available, then this would be nice. But not an imperative need.						
<b>59</b>	Check costs first.						

**64** Very expensive.  
**68** Agree, but who will pay for this?  
**70** When feasible. On all new development.  
**75** This is 2009, we have the technology. They are an eyesore and they are dangerous.  
**77** If a possibility. Looks better.  
**90** This would be nice but pricey.  
**93** Very expensive.  
**106** No need to spend money on this change.  
**110** What would this cost? Is it cost effective?  
**124** Add: "When replacement needed or something." This can cost a lot.  
**135** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.  
**136** Who would pay for this? Taxpayers?  
**138** No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.  
**157** Too expensive.  
**164** Yes. This would so improve the community.  
**166** Very costly. And to what comparable benefit? Perhaps limitations on new construction of overhead power lines are appropriate.  
**172** Why?  
**173** The residents would need to fund this themselves if they do not already have it.  
**174** Not at any cost.  
**175** Nice, but expensive.  
**177** Nice, but costly.  
**178** Yes.  
**180** Top priority if money is available.  
**234** At who's cost?  
**240** Only if adjacent parcels want to pay for it.

PROVIDE STREET LIGHTING ALONG DOUGLAS BOULEVARD, EAST OF AUBURN-FOLSOM ROAD.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		7%	16%	27%	27%	23%	0%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
4	Yes.						
11	No. That will ruin the feel of that area.						
30	OK as is.						
43	Not needed.						
48	Only if residents want and pay in a special zone.						
54	We want a rural community- not lights and sidewalks.						
58	If it helps provide safer driving conditions in spot locations, then it might be worth considering.						
60	Waste of money. Who needs it?						
70	At intersections.						
75	We do not want any more light pollution in Granite Bay than the automall in Roseville provides.						
93	Not consistent with rural "feeling"- maybe at identified key intersections, for safety purposes.						
110	We live in a rural area.						
122	Why?						
136	Again, too much urban-type living. Those living off Douglas would not like lights shining in their home. Who will pay the bill?						
157	What about the residents of those communities that live in that area- do they want that?						
172	No. Keep us rural.						
173	This is not the entrance to a city or a mall. It's the entrance to Folsom Lake.						
174	Strongly no. We should not have any street lights- too much cost. Light pollutes the night.						
180	Mostly residential- not needed.						
229	No.						
230	Keep area rules on lighting the same throughout.						
234	Who pays? Needed: on a scale of 1 - 10.						
240	This degrades the rural atmosphere.						

REVIEW EXISTING SEWER CAPACITY WITHIN THE GRANITE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN AREA.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		21%	29%	28%	10%	10%	1%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
3	Is this a problem? No big development- no need for increased utilities.						
4	Yes.						
17	Absolutely.						
30	No new developments.						
35	No new development as sewer was designed to accommodate build out restraint will slow storm drains.						
41	Current sewer capacity is below capacity, therefore, the sewer is able to handle future growth and development.						
43	Done.						
47	Of course.						
51	If present sewer system cannot handle new development, there should be no increased capacity unless development pays for it.						
59	This should be part of the plan and probably is.						
75	Provide sewer to those of us on septic at prices we can afford so we can upgrade.						
77	Already under study.						
90	Sewers are fine for existing and planned occupants.						
93	Already being done by Facility Services.						
106	I think this has been done already, sewer system seems adequate.						
122	And potential for expansion.						
124	No need to grow.						
135	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
138	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
141	Only if needed.						
157	Only if it is with capacities of old plan.						
164	Isn't this done already?						
172	Why?						
174	Use 2.3 acre lots and you will not need additional sewer capacity.						
240	What is a review? Any increase in sewer capacity required as a result of proposed increases in density should be paid for those who request the density increase. Implement sewer impact fees.						

REVIEW AREAS THAT ARE SUITABLE FOR ON-SITE SEPTIC SYSTEMS.		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
		9%	25%	34%	21%	8%	%
<b>Comments (Survey Respondent # and Comment)</b>							
4	Yes.						
34	Are there that many left?						
43	Not necessary.						
47	Planning/Engineering discretion.						
48	At time of development application.						
54	Leave these alone.						
59	Minimize use of septic tanks. Let MAC review any proposals.						
70	Add the work "evaluation or Perc Test." County should indicate where they are allowed. Property owner should pay for suitability.						
73	Don't understand the question.						
74	Apply County regulations only.						
77	Part of update already?						
78	Up to individual landowner.						
82	If they build they should pay to hook up to the sewer system.						
86	Itchy Acres is perfect to stay septic. 2.3 acres is plenty of space, can use sand filter.						
93	Already part of discretionary approval analysis.						
106	No way.						
107	Not a responsibility of County.						
111	Responsibility of property owner.						
123	County issue, not community plan.						
124	County issue.						
135	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
138	No changes in the existing Granite Bay Community Plan.						
139	Responsibility of property owner prior to allowing rezoning, lot split or subdividing.						
143	Up to property owner.						
148	Owner's responsibility before rezoning or developing.						
156	Let property owner do it.						
157	There is talk of condemning existing ones.						



<b>163</b>	This should already be happening.
<b>164</b>	Isn't this done already?
<b>172</b>	For what?
<b>173</b>	We have septic, it's been fine. My parents chose a lot that had sewer because they thought that was an advantage. The valve at the street failed and raw sewage from other homes flooded into theirs.
<b>174</b>	One acre +
<b>175</b>	On-site septic benefits the community by not requiring off-site infrastructure.
<b>230</b>	Review for what?
<b>236</b>	This is done as necessary by landowners.
<b>240</b>	What is a review?

## GENERAL COMMENTS

<b>1</b>	Ridiculously Vague.
<b>26</b>	These are overwhelming. No sure what mean or issues involved.
<b>45</b>	Provide in writing or email link to all members of the community for all policy issues. Please give adequate notice.
<b>58</b>	I want to emphasize that I do not support any changes to the General Plan because I do not think it is necessary.
<b>137</b>	Keep the 1989 plan- no changes needed. All of these policy changes are incomplete sentences- it is poorly written and I do not agree with most of the proposed changes. The 1989 Plan is well written and is still relevant.
<b>238</b>	These are terrible misleading questions.